DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 264 HE 020 099

AUTHOR Young, Raymond J.; McDougall, William P.
TITLE Recent Changes in Summer Sessions of U.S. and Canadian Colleges and Universities.
INSTITUTION Washington State Univ., Pullman.
SPONS AGENCY North American Association of Summer Sessions, St. Louis, MO.; Western Association of Summer Session Administrators.
PUB DATE Oct 85
NOTE 80p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Programs; Comparative Analysis; Educational Finance; Educational Innovation; Educational Objectives; *Educational Philosophy; *Enrollment Trends; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Institutional Characteristics; Private Colleges; Productivity; *Program Administration; Questionnaires; School Organization; State Colleges; *Summer Programs; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *Canada; *United States

ABSTRACT

A study of summer sessions at U.S. and Canadian colleges and universities was conducted in 1985. A stratified random sample of 213 U.S. public and private institutions included research universities, doctoral-granting institutions, and comprehensive colleges and universities; all 10 Canadian institutions were featured in the study. A total of 184 U.S. colleges (86.3%) and 10 Canadian colleges (100%) provided usable responses. Information was obtained on: summer session organization, mode of office functioning and leadership, enrollments, philosophical attachments, finance, programs, productivity measures, program creativity, and significant differences associated with size, association membership, control, organizational structure, type and location. Many colleges operate summer session programs without a clear statement of role and purpose and the degree to which summer sessions are integrated with the ongoing institution's program. The data show great variation among institutions related to type, size, and geographic location. Compared to private colleges, public college summer session enrollments are generally larger in relation to the academic year and emphasize student needs to a greater extent. The questionnaire is appended, along with a list of participating institutions. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED279264

RECENT CHANGES IN SUMMER SESSIONS OF U.S. AND CANADIAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

BY

RAYMOND J. YOUNG

AND

WILLIAM P. MCDOUGALL

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

OCTOBER, 1985

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 020 099

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Raymond J. Young

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Without the financial help provided by the Research Committees and/or Executive Committees of the Western Association of Summer Session Administrators and of the North American Association of Summer Sessions, this study could never have been conducted. For this assistance the investigators are deeply grateful. Appreciation is expressed to the National University Continuing Education Association Executive Committee and the Association Washington D.C. office staff for the endorsement and help given the study.

Appreciation and gratitude are expressed to the many administrators primarily responsible for academic programs offered during the summer period who took the time to complete the Summer Session Information Schedule and to return it on time. Without their full cooperation a response rate of 92.5% could have not been possible to achieve from USA institutions. Special gratitude is expressed to administrators in Canadian universities whose full cooperation resulted in a response rate of 100%.

Gratitude is expressed to personnel in the Office of Summer Sessions, Washington State University, who helped in finalizing the data gathering instrument and in mailing the requests for information. Resources provided by this office were invaluable.

Acknowledgment is hereby given to Mark Brands for his help in computer data processing. Last but not least, gratitude and appreciation are expressed to Lynn Buckley and Charm Arneson whose patience and secretarial skills made possible several rough drafts as well as the final copy of this report. Thanks are expressed to Donald C. Orlich, Acting Chair, Department of Educational Administration and Supervision, College of Education for making resources available for preparation of the study report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
SECTION	
1. BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY	1
Introduction	1
Background of the Problem	1
Undergirding Structure	3
Philosophical Moorings	3
Historical Antecedents	5
Problem Investigated	6
Study Procedures and Approach	7
Definitions	8
Study Definitions	9
Limitations of the Study	9
Overview of the Report	9
2. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS	11
Introduction	11
Characteristics of the Respondents	11
General Characteristics of Summer Session	13
Organization	13
Operational Functioning	14
Provisions for Leadership	14
Ratio of Summer Enrollments to Regular Year	15
Role and Purposes of Summer Session	16
Relationship to Summer Sessions to Institutional Functioning	16
Purposes for Summer Sessions	17
Operational Features	18
Budget Administration	18
Budget and Programs	20
All Universities	20
United States Universities	20
Summary of Significant USA Relationships	21
Percentages of Budget Expenditures	22
Responsibilities of Summer Session Directors	23
Trends in Financial Support and Status	25
Trends in Enrollments	26
All Institutions	26
USA Institutions	26
Trends in Productivity Measures	27
Creative Summer Session Programs	28
USA Private Comprehensive Universities and Colleges	28

USA Public Comprehensive Universities and Colleges 29
USA Doctoral Granting (Public and Private) . . 32
USA Research Universities (Public and Private) 33
Canadian Universities. 33

3. COMPARATIVE DATA ON TRENDS 35

Introduction 35
Productivity Indices - Curriculum. 35
Predicted and Reported Change. 37
Productivity Indices - Enrollments 37
Change in Financial Conditions 39
Organizational Structure Change. 41
Change in Functioning. 41

4. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 43

Summary. 43
Introduction 43
General Characteristics of Respondents 43
Philosophical Foundations. 43
Summer Session Organization 44
Leadership 45
Programs 46
Enrollments. 47
Productivity Measures. 48
Funding and Finance. 48
Administrator Responsibilities 49
Differences Associated with Institutional Size 50
Differences Associated with Association Membership 51
Differences Associated with Control. 52
Differences Associated with Organizational Structure. 53
Differences associated with Institutional Type 54
Differences associated with Regional Location. 54

Conclusions. 56

General. 56
Conceptual and Philosophical Underpinnings of Summer Session. 56
Leadership 57
Enrollment 58
Organization 58
Finance. 58
Productivity 58
Association Membership 58

Recommendations. 59

REFERENCES. 61

APPENDICES. 62

A. Summer Session Information Schedule. 63

B. List of Cooperating Institutions 68

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Number and Percentage of Institutions By 1984 Headcount Enrollment.	12
2.	Percentages of Universities/Colleges By Summer Session Purpose.	18
3.	Portion of Total Summer Session Budget Allocated For Special Purposes.	22
4.	Percent By Major Responsibility and Change Since 1982	23
5.	Percentages of Respondents By Change in Productivity Indices.	28
6.	Percent Change Regarding Curriculum Productivity Measures	36
7.	Percent Change Regarding Enrollment Productivity Measures	38
8.	Percent By Change Regarding Financial Conditions.	40

SECTION 1

BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

Introduction

In 1982 a study was conducted on summer sessions among public colleges and universities in Canada and the United States classified as Research, Doctoral Granting, and Comprehensive holding memberships in either or both the Western Association of Summer Session Administrators (WASSA) and the North American Association of Summer Sessions (NAASS). The major emphasis was upon organizational structure in relation to a profile of various characteristics. In 1984, a study of summer sessions in all public and private colleges and universities in the USA and Canada similarly classified was undertaken to determine trends since 1982 and to identify innovative programs.

A 33% random sample of all USA institutions stratified by institutional type and public or private control and 100% of the Canadian institutions were included in the 1985 study. The stratified random sample of USA institutions included 33 public and private Research Universities, 28 public and private Doctoral Granting institutions, and 152 public and private Comprehensive Colleges and Universities. A 92.5% response was received from the 213 USA institutions included in the random sample, and a 100% return was received from 10 Canadian Universities.

Non-respondents included 6% (2) of the Research Universities, 14.3% (4) of the Doctoral Granting Universities, and 7% (11) of the Comprehensive Colleges and Universities. Of the 197 responses from USA institutions 184, or 86.3% were usable; all Canadian responses were usable. This is a report of the findings.

Background of the Problem

Exhaustive review of the literature reveals that there exists a paucity of research information on college and university summer sessions. While formally organized summer sessions have become an increasingly important part of total university operation, this portion of the operation has been neglected by researchers until recently. Much of the information on summer sessions is to be found in the form of reports issued by summer session associations and in published journal articles. Since 1970, some literature has appeared in the ERIC collection on microfiche. Many reports and articles are institution and program specific, and other materials are fugitive types which are hard to locate.

The literature on higher education is virtually devoid of information and attention to summer sessions. A number of factors may account for this lack of information. Important among them is the historical perspective and traditional concepts

held by society and professionals about what a university is and what its characteristics are. Also important is the reluctance with which innovations are accepted into an established system by persons in a field. Another equally important factor is the stigma which came to be associated with the summer session due to various abuses of it which were perceived as lowering quality and catering to the self-serving financial and special interest groups. The historic evolution of summer session as an appendage, an add-on, or less respectable yearly activity has contributed undoubtedly to its neglect by writers and researchers.

In 1982, Young and McDougall reported on a study of summer sessions. This study was conducted among public higher education institutions in Canada and the United States holding membership in either or both the North American Association of Summer Sessions (NAASS) and the Western Association of Summer Session Administrators (WASSA). The population included public institutions classified as Research, Doctoral Granting, and Comprehensive Colleges and Universities with such memberships. A stratified 33% random sample of USA universities in the population and all Canadian universities were queried about the nature and direction of organizational structure changes and the status and expected changes of conditions relevant to summer session activities, programs and resources. Information prepared by the investigators in a report entitled Relationships of Selected Factors to Summer Session Organizational Structure, printed by the Faculty of Continuing Education, the University of Calgary for the WASSA and NAASS member administrators. This report was based on a 100% response of the Canadian universities and an 86% response of USA institutions.

Among other things, the 1982 study examined the relationships of organizational structure to institutional size, type, and career patterns of summer session administrators. Also examined was the relationship of administrator's career patterns and kinds of problems experienced by them. Enrollment changes by program field were examined by institutional type, and anticipated changes in enrollments and financial resources were obtained. Based upon the findings of the 1982 study and general reactions to the findings, the need for a definitive study of all public and private colleges and universities, not just association members, was deemed to be of value. Value might accrue to administrators having responsibility for the summer session portion of total university operation and to the field of higher education from a scholarly perspective. Thus, the nation-wide study in Canada and the USA recorded in this report was conducted. The major emphases were (1) to examine selected characteristics of summer session relating to role in the institutional operation and trends since 1982 in resources, enrollments, and responsibilities and (2) to identify programs and activities deemed to be innovative, exemplary, unique, or experimental.

Undergirding Structure

Philosophical Moorings

The raison d´etre for the summer session portion of a university´s total operation may legitimately be that of the university itself in the larger society where it exists. One could deduce from the functions of creating, preserving, and transmitting, knowledge at the literal, interpretative, and applied levels a theory base for just the summer session. To do so seems an academic exercise in futility which neglects the gestalt of the organization of which it is a component. One of the obstacles and shortcomings of higher education as a field of study generally is the lack of a coherent comprehensive theory or system of theoretical constructs which have been tested, verified, and appropriately modified as new information is generated.

Of time-tested value in any human endeavor to create knowledge in a given field of human activity is sound verifiable, accurate information about the past and/or present status of a phenomena. After observing similarities, consistencies, dissimilarites, and inconsistencies in conditions as they are revealed, a unified system of principles, definitions, postulates, and observations can be developed and organized in such a way as to most simply explain the interconnections and interrelationships among or between variables. Such observation is essential to the inductive generation of propositions, hypotheses, definitions, principles, and postulates. These inductive generalizations can then serve as the undergirding for subsequent and further investigation of the facts as they may be found regarding a phenomenon. It seems ironical that status information such as was produced by the 1982 study and which adds to the fund of current knowledge in the field of higher education would be denied to researchers and practioners on a broad base. Such denial may have been due to lack of interest or to some who perceive themselves as knowledgeable scholars, but who fail to understand the proper relationship between facts and theory construction.

Until passage of the Morrill Act July 2, 1862, higher education in the United States had been perceived as duplicative and variations of the English classical colleges and the German research universities. For some time after the passage of the Act as ammended in 1890, 1905, 1907, and 1914, collegiate level programs designed to prepare students for work in new and developing professions emerging to serve societal demands and interests were viewed with disdain and lack of respect as not having a legitimate place within institutions of higher learning. Engineering and the mechanical arts and teacher preparation were examples of disciplines which were considered disreputable. Separate institutions were established to care for the preparation of teachers thus abrogating the "respectable" university or college from that responsibility. The difficult (hard fought) evolution of normal schools to modern university

status in title and function and the reluctant incorporation of teacher education into universitites is well-known to higher education scholars.

With the advent of the land grant universities authorized by the Morrill Act, a separate system of higher educational institutions designed to perform functions needed by society and neglected by existing institutions was established. It remained for Harper at the University of Chicago to break the traditional lock step concept of what constituted a university (Slosson, 1910). Efforts to change and loosen up the system had been previously advocated by Eliot (1869, 1898) in his inaugural address as president of Harvard College and in part reiterated in an address before the newly formed National Education Association in 1892. While Eliot´s concerns focused on curriculum rigidity and lengthening time required for degree program completion, Harper´s focus for reform was upon the basic functions of a university (Goodspeed, 1925).

After having visited several newly formed universities to discover new departures being undertaken in higher education, Slosson (1910) wrote of the University of Chicago:

> Most prominent among the innovations directed toward setting the university free from its confinement within four walls and four years were the summer quarter, the press, the extension work, the downtown classes, the correspondence courses, and the affiliated colleges (p. 406).

According to Slosson, the most radical and successful of the innovations was the summer quarter, for it served to loosen up the college system and give it a flexibility that fostered instructional adaptation to varying conditions. The effect was more pronounced than shortening the college program or utilizing building spaces more efficiently which were other outcomes of the summer quarter.

Harper discarded the old theory that education was like the measles in that a person should get it once and for all in his youth and be done with it. His aim was to make the summer session the full equivalent of the other quarters and to develop an ongoing educational process, not just a once-in-a-lifetime experience. Over time it became the most important quarter both in enrollments and quality of work, and Harper used the summer session to develop intense loyalities to the university. The fundamental principle upon which he built the university was <u>service</u> to students, to the public, and to mankind. Although American universities had previously confined their work to local areas, Harper´s purpose was to extend college and university instruction to the public at large and to disseminate knowledge through the university press. He believed that while graduate faculty and students should continuously contribute to the existing fields of knowledge, there were large numbers of persons who could not attend the university that would profit by college instruction through correspondence, loaned books, evening

classes, and lectures by faculty in local areas. Thus, he borrowed the extension idea from the successful movement of that type in England.

Harper believed that whether a student desired to return to a university at periodic times depended in large measure upon whether it is a reservoir or a spring. If a university is but only a reservoir or storehouse of static information a potential client (credit or non-credit seeking student) most likely will decide to get along without it. But, if the university is progressive and creative, students will be drawn back to it repeatedly. Respect for gray hair, regardless of prior degree (including a Ph.D.) in the provision of life long learning was deemed important by Harper. Thus, began the innovation of formally organized summer sessions and extension services as functions of a university in the United States.

Almost twenty years later, the Smith Lever Act of 1914 (Statutes at Large, p. 372) was passed by the Congress ". . . to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between agricultural colleges in the several states receiving benefits of an Act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture." This Act legitimized a specialized form of extension service as an integral part of the new developing breed of universities.

Historical Antecedents

Research on the historical development of summer sessions reveals that sponsorers of various on-going forms of educational cultural activities sought favor and support from collegiate institutions. This occurred during the last two decades of the 19th century and the first decade of the 20th century. Chief among them were activities spawned by the Chautauqua movement and the adult education movement which had been growing since colonial days. Various manifestations of the adult education movement had occurred in the form of literary, debate, and historical societies, Lyceums, women's clubs, reading circles, institutes, and summer conferences.

As teacher eligibility and recertification requirements increased throughout the first 40 years of the 20th century many universities that had incorporated teacher education as a function followed the practice begun in teachers colleges and normal schools of offering undergraduate level credit work toward a degree during summer session to accommodate the educational interests of academic year full-time working teachers. With programs in operation during the summer period of the year, other types of clientele such as young regular college students wanting to accelerate their program or to make up deficiencies gradually became attracted. In 1917, representatives of 200 higher education institutions assembled in Washington by the Council of National Defense recommended the four-quarter plan as a means of more fully utilizing their plants, faculties, and students in the war effort. A large number of institutions subsequently made the

change, but after World War I, few remained on either a four-quarter or three semester system (Cowley, 1932 and DeCou, 1920). In the years following 1945, as a result of the Veterans Readjustment Act, hordes of war veterans in a hurry to prepare for job entry flocked to the campuses of USA institutions on a year-round enrollment basis. There had been a pronounced shift to the four-quarter system during World War II from 8.3% to 14.7% of degree granting institutions (Winston and Farr, n.d.) As the wave of demand began to subside in the late 1940's or early 1950's, collegiate institutions accustomed to summer time revenues turned to marketing strategies in an attempt to attract consumers.

As periodic surveys by the North American Association of Summer Sessions have shown, some universities incorporated a summer session term into a regular year-round calendar of operation in the same manner as that implemented at the University of Chicago. This was done for philosophical as well as practical reasons of allowing better student access, utilizing resources more efficiently, and accommodating the growing inclination among adults of all ages to pursue learning for one reason or another on a life-long basis. However, a large majority of universities reverted back to the earlier practice of viewing the summer part of the year as somehow different, separate, and disconnected from the regular traditional concept of academic year just as they had done after World War I. Custom and tradition have had a strong and continuous impact on perpetuating a higher education system sired by an agrarian and frontier society.

It might be anticipated that if universities seek to develop as fresh springs from which flow new knowledge that is created rather than being only reservoirs of knowledge to be transmitted; functional, organizational, and structural changes would be reflected in operations during the summer months. The attempt to produce information on the character and nature of summer period university operations and the detection and monitoring of trends may provide indices to how the role of universities may or may not be changing in response to societal demands. Briefly, this is the philosophical and historical bases and premise undergirding this study.

Problem Investigated

The major problem investigated was to discover how changes in the nature and characteristics of summer sessions in selected colleges and universities in the United States and Canada may be related to institutional size, type, location, and organizational and administrative structure. Specific questions were:

1. What are the institutional profiles for summer sessions and how have they been changing with regard to: (a) administrative structure, (b) role and purpose, (c) selected operational features, (d) administrative responsibilities, (e) nature of enrollments, and (f) financial support.

2. What relationships exist between the factors mentioned in item 1 above and (a) institutional size, (b) control (public or nonpublic), (c) type as classified by the Carnegie council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, (d) geographical location, (e) whether membership was held in either WASSA or NAASS, and (f) organization of the summer session (separate or integral).

3. How are changes related to selected aspects of organizational and administrative structures of summer sessions?

4. What summer session programs and activities are considered innovative, unique, exemplary, or experimental?

Study Procedures and Approach

The population for the study included 62 public and 36 non-public universities classified as Research Universities I and II, 57 public and 28 non-public institutions classified as Doctoral Granting Universities I and II, and 294 public and 163 non-public institutions classified as Comprehensive Colleges and Universities I and II. A 33% stratified random sample of these institutions was drawn for study. The study was endorsed by the National University Continuing Education Association and funded in part by the joint Research Committee of the Western Association of Summer Session Administrators (WASSA) and the North American Association of Summer Sessions (NAASS).

A questionnaire titled "Summer Session Information Schedule" was developed by the researchers (see Appendix A). A rough draft copy was mailed to eight knowledgeable summer session chief administrators active in the field and known for their research and publications. Each was asked to critique the questionnaire in view of the study intent and purposes and to offer suggestions on content, style, and format. A number of helpful suggestions were incorporated into the final printed version.

In May 1985, a printed questionnaire was forwarded to the chief summer session administrator of each institution in the sample holding membership in one or both of the funding sponsor organizations. For other institutions the letters were addressed simply to Chief Summer Session Administrator. Enclosed in each mailing was a cover letter inviting cooperation and a franked addressed return envelope needing no postage. By May 29, 1985, returns had been received from 29.1%. A second mailing was made to non-respondents in June, and by July 13, a response of 69.5% had been received. A follow-up reminder post card was then mailed, and by August 16, the response rate was 76.5% of USA institutions and 70% of the Canadian institutions. In August, letters were again sent to non-responding Canadian summer session directors and to the president or vice president of each non-responding institution in the United States. By September 25,

response from Canadian universities was 100% and from USA institutions 93.8%. Usable responses were: USA - 86.4%; Canada - 100%. An additional 2.3% of USA returns were too late to be included.

Data were edited, coded, and processed by computer at Washington State University.

Attempts were made to obtain funds from another source to find answers to the question of what factors are most associated with the presence of innovative, unique, experimental or exemplary programs. These funds did not materialize.

Definitions

The following definitions were used by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education to classify institutions. Classifications were:

Research University I - institutions awarding at least 50 Ph.D. degrees (plus M.D. degrees if a medical school was on the same campus) and were among the 50 leading universities in terms of federal financial support of academic science in at least two of three years prior to classification.

Research University II - institutions awarding 50 Ph.D. degrees (plus M.D. degrees if a medical school was on the same campus). At least 25 of the degrees must have been Ph.D.'s or the institution was among the leading 60 in terms of total number of Ph.D.'s awarded during a 10-year period previous to classification. In addition an institution was among the 100 leading institutions in terms of federal financial support in at least two of three academic years prior to classification.

Doctoral Granting Universities I - institutions receiving $3 million in total federal support or that awarded at least 40 or more and no less than 20 Ph.D.'s in at least five fields (plus M.D.'s if on the same campus) regardless of amount of federal support.

Doctoral Granting II - institutions awarding at least 20 Ph.D.'s in a year without regard to field prior to classification or 10 Ph.D. degrees in at least three fields.

Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I - institutions that offered a liberal arts program as well as several other programs, such as engineering and business administration. Many offered master's degrees, but all lacked a doctoral program or had an extremely limited doctoral program. All had at least two professional or occupational programs and enrolled at least 2,000 students.

Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II - public or private colleges offering a liberal arts program and at least one professional or occupational program such as teacher education or nursing. Many were former teachers colleges that broadened programs to include a liberal arts curriculum. In general, private institutions with less than 1,500 students or public institutions with fewer than 1,000 students were not included even though they offered a selection of programs, because they were not regarded as being comprehensive with such small enrollments.

Study Definitions

Research University - all institutions classified as I or II by the Carnegie group in this category.

Doctoral Granting - all institutions classified a I or II by the Carnegie group in this category.

Comprehensive Universities and Colleges - all institutions classified as I or II by the Carnegie group in this category.

Regular academic year - as used in this report, this phrase is intended to mean the academic terms other than the one held during the summer period.

Significant difference, significantly more (or less) - these terms refer to the statistical level of confidence that an observed difference occurred due to something other than chance and are associated with the rejection of an hypothesis of no difference. Levels of confidence are expressed in parenthesis such as (.01) based on Chi-square tests of independence appropriately applied to all analyses.

Limitations of the Study

Although the response rate of USA institutions was 93.8%, usable responses were 86.4%, one can never know how the remaining 6.2% might have responded. A visual inspection of responses (2.3%) that arrived long after the deadline and too late for inclusion did not appear to be different than the general response mode. While lack of a 100% total response may be a slight limitation, it is doubtful if the inclusion of responses from late returns and those who did not respond would have materially affected results.

Overview of the Report

Section 2 contains a report of findings from the current study. In Section 3 are presented some comparative data from the 1982 study. Finally, in Section 4 will be found a summary, conclusions, and recommendations growing out of the study.

SECTION 2

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Introduction

In this section will be found information on selected characteristics of the institutions participating in the study, general characteristics of summer session organization and functioning, and role and purposes of summer session. A description is given of such operational features as budget administration, and budget and programs. Trends in responsibilities of summer session administrators and in financial support and status, enrollments, and productivity measures are revealed. Summer session programs reported as being exemplary, innovative, experimental or unique have been identified.

All data for USA institutions have been analyzed by institutional size (less than and over 8,000 headcount), control (public or private), and type (research, doctoral granting, or comprehensive), geographical location (regional accrediting association areas), association membership (WASSA or NAASS), and organization of the summer session (integral or separate). Cross analysis controlling for and parceling out the influence of each factor, such as size, were made. Appropriate Chi-Square statistical tests of independence have been applied to all analyses, and only differences statistically significant at the .05 level or higher have been reported. Non-responses were eliminated for this purpose.

Because of the desire to generalize to the total population and not to just those institutions in the total population who would, if contacted, probably respond to such a data gathering effort, percentages of responses displayed were calculated on the basis of the total number of usable responses in the study rather than on the total that responded to a given question. Percentages of non-response may have meaning, and percentages based only on total number of respondents to each question would have been spuriously inflated as an index to conditions as they most probably exist in the total population.

Characteristics of the Respondents

Numbers and percentages of colleges and universities providing usable responses are shown in Table 1 by headcount enrollment for fall 1984. One can see that 70% of the Canadian and 88% of the USA institutions had enrollments of 14,000 or less. About 61% of the USA institutions and 20% of the Canadian institutions had enrollments of 8,000 or less. A larger percentage of the WASSA and NAASS members (26%) than others (19%) had enrollments over 14,000 as well as over 8,000. About 3% of the USA and none of the Canadian universities enrolled

TABLE 1

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF INSTITUTIONS BY

1984 HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT

Headcount Enrollment Category	USA		Canada	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No Response	1	0.5	0	0.0
Less than 3,000	56	30.4	2	20.0
3,001-8,000	56	30.4	0	0.0
8,001-14,000	32	17.4	5	50.0
14,001-20,000	15	8.2	1	10.0
20,001-34,999	19	10.3	2	20.0
35,000 or more	5	2.7	0	00.0
Totals	184	99.9	10	100.0

35,000 or more headcount students. Among USA universities, the largest percentage with enrollments over 8,000 were in the North Central accrediting association region, and the largest percentages of private universities were located in the New England, Middle States, and Southern regions.

Seventy-two percent of all universities operated on a semester academic calendar, 14% on a quarter system, and 8% on a 4-1-4 calendar. Three percent were on a trimester system, and 3% reported some other system. There was no significant difference between USA WASSA and NAASS members and other USA institutions. Significantly (.01) more USA public than private universities were on the semester or quarter calendar, while more private universities were on a trimester, 4-1-4, or other calendar.

Geographically, 32% of all institutions were in the North Central accrediting association region; 28% were from the Southern region. Others were from the following regions: 17% Middle States, 9% New England, 6% each from the Western and Northwestern regions, and 2% did not identify the location. Larger percentages of the USA WASSA and NAASS members than others were from the North Central, New England, Western and Northwestern regions. Larger percentages of non-association members than members were from the Southern and Middle States regions.

An analysis between regional location and type of institutional control of USA institutions revealed a statistically significant difference (.01). While about the same percentages of public and private institutions were from the North Central, New England, and North-western regions, larger percentages of private than public institutions were located in the Middle States and Western regions, and a larger percentage of public than private institutions were from the Southern region.

General Characteristics of Summer Session

Organization

In two-thirds (67%) of all universities or colleges responding, the summer session was separate from the regular academic term. In 26%, the summer session was an integral part of the year-round operation and of coordinate or equal rank with other academic terms. Six percent of the respondents reported some other arrangement, and 1% did not reply to the question. Significantly (.01) more of the USA universities operating on the semester or quarter calendar than other calendars organized summer sessions separate from the regular academic year. There was no significant difference in organization of the summer session according to size, location, association membership, public or private control, or institution type (research, doctoral granting, or comprehensive).

Eight of every ten respondents indicated there had been no administrative reorganization within the institution since 1982 which affected the organizational placement of administration and responsibility for the summer session. This was the case whether summer session was an integral part of year round operations or a separate entity. Nineteen percent reported a change, and 1% failed to respond to the question. Change had occurred in a smaller percentage (10%) of the Canadian institutions than in those of the USA (20%). No statistically significant difference existed in the USA between WASSA and NAASS members and other institutions on these matters. Change in this regard was unrelated to academic year calendar, type of control (public or private), enrollment size, or institutional type. Since 1982, there had been an administrative reorganization in a significantly (.01) larger percentage of USA universities in the North Central and Western-Northwestern regions (29%) than in other regions (12%) which affected the organizational placement of administration and responsibility for summer session.

Change in the USA institutions included summer sessions that had become a separate entity administratively (3%) and budgetarily (4%). Five percent had become a separate entity in both respects. Ten percent of the USA summer sessions were combined with the Continuing Education, Extended Learning and/or other Extension/Public Service Unit as were 10% of the Canadian institutions. Three percent of the USA institutions had diffused the summer session among academic units (schools, colleges, departments). In 2% of the USA institutions, summer session had been organized into the College of Arts and Sciences, while in 3% it was organized as part of the Graduate School. In 7% of the USA institutions, summer session had been subsumed under another larger administrative office (e.g. academic affairs, registrar, etc.). Some other change had occurred in 1%. Between 1982 and 1984 the degree of administrative centralization for programming in all institutions had increased in 11% of the institutions, decreased in 6%, and remained the same in 77%. Six percent didn't reply to this question.

Operational Functioning

Respondents were asked in which fashion the summer session office carried out responsibilities regarding the summer session academic program. In USA institutions, 5% of the summer session offices take primary responsibility for the development of the summer session program. In 26% of the USA and 40% of the Canadian institutions the summer session office develops the academic program in cooperation with the departments, schools, and colleges. However, in 25% of the USA and 10% of the Canadian Universities/Colleges, the summer session office coordinates the academic program which has been developed by the academic units. In one-half of the Canadian institutions and 28% of those in the USA, a combination of the latter two approaches is used. Some other method is used in 3% of the USA institutions; 13% failed to respond.

The functioning mode of the office was unrelated to type of control (public or private), academic year calendar, association membership, institutional size, regional location, or how the summer session was institutionally organized (separate entity or integral part of academic year). However a significant difference (.01) was found by USA institutional type. In Research universities, the summer session office was reported to coordinate academic programs which had been developed by instructional units in 50% of the institutions compared to 37% and 23%, respectively, in Doctoral Granting and Comprehensive institutions. The development of programs in cooperation with academic units was the practice in 34% of the Comprehensive universities compared to 21% in Doctoral Granting and 14% in Research universities.

Provisions for Leadership

During the regular academic year, summer session directors devoted over 70% of their time to management of the summer session in only 6% of the institutions. During the regular academic year, percentages of directors in USA institutions devoting time to summer session management during the academic year were: 6% devoted 70%-100%; 9% devoted 40%-70%; 13% devoted 30%-39%; 11% devoted 20%-29%; 44% devoted less than 20%, and 17% did not reply (some have no summer session director as such because they are on a year-round schedule). In most (60%) of the Canadian universities the summer session director devoted less than 30% of the work time during the regular academic year to summer session management, but in one institution (10%), the director devoted 90%-100% of the time to this responsibility. About one-third of the Canadian directors reported devoting 40%-49% of their time during the regular year. The median amount of time devoted to management in USA institutions during the regular year was 19% compared to 26% for Canadian universities.

During the summer session, 40% of both USA and Canadian university summer session directors were reported devoting 30% or less time to the responsibility. Twenty-six percent of the USA and 30% of the Canadian directors of summer sessions were

reported to devote 70% or more time to management during the summer session. Eighteen and 30%, respectively, of the USA and Canadian institutions reported the summer session director devoted 40% to 69% of their time to management during the summer session. Sixteen percent of USA institutions did not respond. The median amount of time devoted in USA institutions to management was 44% during the summer session compared to 49% in Canadian universities.

Amount of time devoted either during the year or during summer session to management was unrelated to institutional control (public or private), calendar, institutional size, or how the summer session was administratively organized in the institution. However, there was a statistically significant difference (.01) between USA association members and other institutions in time devoted during the regular academic year to summer session management.

Larger percentages of USA association members (30% compared to 16%) devoted 89%-100% of their time during the summer session as did 50%-69% (22% compared to 10%), and 20%-39% (25% compared to 18%). Larger percentages of non-association member administrators (12% compared to 6%) devoted 70% to 79% and less than 20% (38% compared to 12%) of their time during the summer session to summer session management. About the same percentage (5%) of both members and non-members devoted 60%-69% of their time during the summer session. In general, summer session directors in institutions holding association membership devoted significantly (.01) more time during the summer session to summer session management than did those in non-member institutions.

During the regular academic year, more USA summer session administrators in association member institutions than others devoted 90%-100% of their time (9% compared to 2%) and 20%-79% (58% compared to 29%). A significantly (.01) larger percentage of administrators in non-association member institutions (68%) devoted less than 20% of their time to summer session management during the regular academic year. In general, summer session administrators in association member institutions devoted significantly (.01) more time to summer session management during the regular year than did those in other institutions.

Ratio of Summer Enrollments to Regular Year

Ratios of 1984 summer session credit enrollments in USA institutions to regular year credit enrollments were: 1-2(6%), 1-3(20%), 1-4(16%), 1-5(14%), 1-6(10%), 1-7(5%), and other (14%). Fifteen percent gave no response. In Canadian institutions, ratios were 1-3(40%), 1-4(10%), 1-5(30%), 1-7(10%), and other (10%). These ratios were unrelated to academic calendar, summer session organization, institutional size, association membership, or geographical location. A highly significant (.01) difference was found by type of control. A larger percentage of public institutions (39%) than private (13%) reported ratios of 1-2 and 1-3, and a larger percentage of private institutions (57%) than public (15%) were reported to have ratios of 1-6, 1-7 or some smaller ratio.

Role and Purposes of Summer Session

Relationship of Summer Session to Institutional Functioning

Ninety-three percent of the respondents indicated their institution had an institutional role and mission statement for the campus, and 90% indicated the statement had been adopted/approved by the governing board. Only about one-fifth (21%) indicated there was a written statement for the mission and goals of the summer session. In the USA, a significantly (.01) larger percentage of summer session association members than others had such a statement.

Only 9% of all respondents indicated a written mission and goals statement for the summer session had been approved by the institutional community including the central administration. Sixteen percent of the respondents indicated the role and mission statement for the summer session had been reviewed internally within the past three years.

Nearly three-fifths of the respondents (57%) indicated there was a written statement of specific policies and operating procedures (rules and regulations) for the summer session. A statistically larger percentage (.01) of association members than others had such written policies and procedure statements. In nearly one-third of the institutions the summer session operation is included in the by-laws of the institution. Twenty-eight percent reported having a handbook (or other document) containing the mission and goals statement and the policies and procedures for summer session which can be used to inform deans, departmental chairpersons, or academic unit heads.

In about one-half the responding institutions, the chief administrator of the summer session is an ex-officio member of appropriate faculty senate committees such as those concerned with calendar, budget, academic affairs, etc.

Responses from USA institutions on the institutional role and mission of summer sessions were analyzed for relationships with such factors as enrollment size, type geographical location, organization of the summer session (separate or integral part), control, and calendar. Only those relationships found to be statistically significant are reported. Factors related to association membership have been noted above. Significantly (.01) more USA institutions over 8,000 enrollment than others had an institutional role and mission statement for the campus, as did public compared to private institutions (.05). Significantly (.05) more USA public institutions in the West and Northwest (43%) had written statements of the mission and goals of summer sessions than in other accrediting regions of the country (5% North Central, 25% New England and Middle States, and 20% Southern). Significantly (.05) more USA private institutions in the Southern and New England-Middle States regions (54%) than in other regions (14%) indicated the operation of summer session is included in the by-laws of the institution. In significantly (.01) more institutions with enrollments over 8,000 (57%) than

others (34%) the chief summer session administrator was an ex-officio member of appropriate faculty senate committees such as those concerned with calendar, budget, academic affairs, etc. Significantly (.01) more USA public than private institutions with enrollments over 8,000 have summer session administrators on appropriate faculty senate committees such as those concerned with calendar, budget, academic affairs, etc.

A significantly (.01) larger percentage (97%) of the Comprehensive than Doctoral Granting (90%) or Research (81%) universities had a role and mission statement for the campus. No difference existed by institution type in having a summer session mission and goals statement, a written statement of specific policies and operating procedures, or the inclusion of summer session operation in the by-laws of the institutions. Chief summer session administrators in significantly (.05) more Comprehensive (63%) than Research or Doctoral Granting institutions (42% each) served on appropriate faculty senate committees.

Purposes for Summer Sessions

Shown in Table 2 are the percentages of USA and Canadian higher education institutions according to the major purposes for summer session on the campus. In both Canadian and USA institutions, the most important purposes were providing courses for regular degree students, other identifiable groups, and regular academic year students needing to make up deficiencies.

Respondents were asked to indicate the three purposes they believed were most important, and the rank order was for reasons as cited above.

There was no difference between USA association members and other institutions on purposes. A significantly (.05) larger percentage of USA institutions with separate summer sessions offered special programs not regularly offered for selected groups such as alumni, senior citizens, etc. While there was a high level of agreement among public and private institutions that the purpose of greatest importance by rank order was to provide courses for the institution's regular degree students, there were differences statistically significant at the .05 level on the second and third order of purposes. Respondents in public institutions placed greater emphasis on providing courses for identifiable groups other than regular degree students, providing summer employment for faculty, and attracting new admissions to the institution for the regular term. Non-public institutions placed more emphasis on better utilization of plant facilities during the summer period and providing income for the institution's general budget. Public institutions more than private emphasized the purposes of permitting regular academic year students to make up deficiencies and encouraging and providing a setting for experimental offerings.

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGES OF UNIVERSITIES/COLLEGES

BY SUMMER SESSION PURPOSE

Purpose for Summer Session	Institutions		
	USA	Canadian	Both
Provide courses for regular degree students	98	100	99
Provide courses for identifiable groups other than regular degree students	82	100	83
More fully utilize plant facilities	63	80	64
Provide summer employment for faculty	57	20	55
Attract new admissions for the regular academic term	53	20	51
Provide income to the institutions general budget	54	20	53
Encourage and provide a setting for experimental offerings	39	70	40
Offer special programs not regularly offered for selected groups such as alumni, senior citizens, etc.	40	50	41
Permit regular academic year students to make up deficiencies	84	100	85
Other purposes	5	0	5

Operational Features

Budget Administration

In 79% of all institutions from which a usable response was returned, the budget for summer session was included in the total institutional budget just as for any other operational unit. In two-thirds of the institutions, the chief administrator of the summer session has authority to allocate budget to academic units within broad institutional guidelines. In nearly three-fourths of the institutions (74%) use was made of contingency contracts for summer session teaching faculty. Nearly one-fourth of the respondents indicated there had been a change in the basis for determining summer session faculty salaries since 1982.

In 1984, there was greater dependency on self-support monies for summer session in 21% of the institutions than was the case in 1982.

Significant relationships among USA institutions regarding budget administration are reported here; relationships not mentioned were not found to be significant. A significantly (.02) larger percentage of North Central region universities (91%) than those in other regions reported that the summer session budget was included in the total institutional budget just as for any other operational unit. Significantly (.05) more public institutions in the North Central region (91%) than in other regions (Northwest and Western - 43%, New England-Middle States - 67%, and Southern - 70%) were reported to include the summer session budget in the total institutional budget just as for any other operating unit. A significantly (.05) larger percentage of universities with summer session as an integral part of the year round operation included the summer session in the total institutional budget and included operation of the summer session in the by-laws of the institution. A larger percentage of private (87% compared to 75%) than public institutions included summer session in the total institutional budget. Significantly (.05) more of the non-association members (WASSA or NAASS) than members included the summer session budget as an integral part of the total institutional budget (84% compared to 71%).

In a significantly (.01) larger percentage of USA public (78%) than private (59%) institutions, the chief summer session administrator (or whomever is responsible) has authority to allocate budget to academic units within broad budget guidelines of the institution.

A significantly (.01) larger percentage of New England-Middle States region universities (92%) than those in other regions (71%) used contingency contracts for summer session teaching faculty. In this area a significantly (.05) larger percentage of institutions using such contracts had enrollments under 8,000 (52%) than over 8,000 (21%). A significantly (.01) larger percentage (87%) of the public universities in the Southern and New England-Middle States regions than others (57%) made use of contingency contracts for summer session teaching faculty.

Since 1982, change in the basis for determining summer session faculty salaries had been significantly (.05) greater among public universities in the New England-Middle States region (46%) than in the other regions (North Central - 26%, Southern - 17%), and Western-Northwest - 14%). Significantly (.05) more public institutions with enrollments over 8,000 (82%) than others (67%) had a change since 1982 in the basis for determining summer session faculty salaries.

A significantly (.05) larger percentage of universities in the Southern and Western-Northwestern regions than those in other regions reported greater dependency on self support monies in 1984 than in 1982 for summer session. A significantly (.01)

larger percentage of non-association members than members (WASSA or NAASS) (28% compared to 12%) experienced greater dependency on self-support monies for summer session than they did in 1982.

Budget and Programs

All Universities. Summer session undergraduate admission requirements were reported different than those in effect during the regular academic year by 24% of all respondents. A significantly (.05) larger percentage of association members than others reported different admission requirements for summer session. Summer session budgets in 40% of all institutions included some monies for student activities such as cultural or social events (picnics, dances, lectures, readings, tours, drama, etc.). In 23% of all institutions a portion of the total summer session budget (excluding indirect and/or overhead costs) was allocated for graduate assistantships, and in 17%, a portion of such funds was allocated for public service non-credit programs. Thirteen percent allocated a portion of such funds for faculty research, while 7% made faculty fellowships available also from the summer session budget.

United States Universities. Among USA institutions, relationships between types of budget-program practices and other factors were analyzed. Only those found to be statistically significant are reported here. Summer session undergraduate admission requirements were reported to be different than those in effect during the regular academic year in a significantly (.01) larger percentage (71%) of USA public universities in the Western and Northwestern region than in other regions (19% - North Central, 16% - Southern, and 32% New England and Middle States).

Significantly (.05) larger percentages of universities with summer sessions organized as an integral part of the year round operation than others allocated a portion of the summer session budget for faculty research, public service non-credit programs, graduate assistantships, and for student cultural and social events. More public (48%) than private (32%) institutions included monies from the summer session budget for cultural and social events (.05 level of significance). A significantly (.01) larger percentage (66%) of USA institutions under 8,000 enrollment than others (49%) included monies in the summer session budget for such student activities. This was especially true for private institutions (.05) with smaller enrollments (76%) compared to larger ones (39%).

Significantly (.05) more universities in the North Central region with enrollments over 8,000 (61%) than less enrollment (28%) funded such events from the summer session budget. Enrollment size in other regions was not found related. This is an exception to the general picture nationally where such activities are predominantly found in institutions with less than 8,000 enrollment, especially in private institutions.

Graduate assistantships were supported from a portion of the summer session budget in a significantly (.01) larger percentage

of the institutions where summer session is organized as an integral part of the year round university operation. Among public universities in the North Central and Southern regions and private universities in the Southern region, there were significantly (.05) larger percentages of graduate assistantships supported by monies allocated from the summer session budget than was the case in other regions. Significantly (.01) more graduate assistantships were allocated as a part of the summer session budget in institutions with less than 8,000 enrollment (81%) compared to others (63%) with larger enrollments. However, in the North Central area, a significantly (.01) larger percentage of institutions enrolling over 8,000 than others (44% compared to 11%) used summer session budget monies for graduate assistantships. This was a deviation from circumstances in other regions.

A significantly (.05) larger percentage of institutions organized with summer session as an integral part of the year round operation than others also used a portion of the summer session budget to fund public service non-credit programs. However, a significantly (.05) larger percentage of institutions in which the summer session was a separate entity funded faculty research from a portion of the summer session budget. A significantly (.05) larger percentage of North Central region public universities than those in other regions allocated monies from the summer session budget for faculty research.

Faculty fellowships were made available from the summer session budget in significantly (.01) more institutions (95%) with under 8,000 enrollment than in others (87%). A larger percentage of public than private institutions (10% compared to 2%) supported such fellowships. In the Southern region, a significantly (.05) larger percentage of institutions supporting faculty fellowships from summer session budgets had enrollments over 8,000. In no other region was institutional size related to this practice.

Summary of Significant USA Relationships. Summer session budget monies were used to support student cultural and social events (picnics, dances, lectures, readings, tours, drama, etc.) in significantly more universities when summer session is organized as part of a year round operation, in more public than private, and in more institutions with less than 8,000 enrollment, except in the North Central area. A portion of such funds was used for graduate assistantships in significantly more public universities in the North Central and Southern regions than in other regions, in more private than public universities in the Southern region, in more institutions with less than 8,000 headcount enrollment than others, except in the North Central region, and in summer sessions organized as an integral part of the year round operation. Public service non-credit programs were supported from the summer session budget in significantly more institutions where summer session was an integral part of year round operation, but such support for faculty research was found in significantly more institutions where the summer session was organized as a separate entity and in the North Central

region more than in other regions. Significantly more institutions provided from such funds faculty fellowships in more public than private and with less than 8,000 headcount enrollment, except in the Southern region.

Percentages of Budget Expenditures. Respondents from institutions indicating a portion of the summer session budget, exclusive of indirect and/or overhead costs, was allocated for graduate assistantships, public service non-credit programs, and faculty research were asked what percentage of the budget was allocated for such purposes. Shown in Table 3 are the numbers of institutions, by type, according to percent of the budget allocated for each purpose. For example, it can be seen that 3 public comprehensive institutions allocated 1% of the summer session budget for graduate assistantships exclusive of indirect and/or overhead costs.

TABLE 3

PORTION OF TOTAL SUMMER SESSION BUDGET ALLOCATED FOR SPECIAL PURPOSES

Type of Institution	Percentages										
	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	10	12	15	20
Graduate Assistantships											
Research, Public				1			1				1
Research, Private		1									
Doctoral Granting Public		1	1	1	1						
Doctoral Granting Private		1									
Comprehensive, Public	3	2						2			
Comprehensive, Private				1				2			
Canadian University				1							
TOTALS	3	5	1	4	1	0	1	4	0	0	1
Public Service Non-Credit Programs											
Research, Public								1			
Research, Private								1			
Doctoral Granting, Public											
Doctoral Granting, Private											
Comprehensive, Public	1	1	1	2				1	1	1	1
Comprehensive, Private	3			1							1
Canadian University											
TOTALS	4	1	1	3	0	0	0	3	1	1	2
Faculty Research											
Research, Public							1				
Research, Private											
Doctoral Granting, Public						1		1	1[a]		
Doctoral Granting, Private						1		1	1[a]		
Comprehensive, Public		1							1		
Comprehensive, Private				1							
Canadian University											
TOTALS	0	1	0	1	0	2	1	2	3	0	0

[a]Less than 10%

Observation reveals that most institutions funding graduate assistantships and non-credit public service programs with a portion of the summer session operating budget expend 5% or less for each purpose. Most institutions funding faculty research from the summer session operational budget expend between 8%-12% for that purpose.

Responsibilities of Summer Session Directors

Respondents of all universities were asked to indicate the types of work pertinent to summer sessions for which they had major (more than anyone else) responsibility and how the responsibility had changed since 1982. Shown in Table 4 are the results by percent of responses indicating major responsibilities of administrators and how the responsibility had changed. For example, it can be seen that 62% had major responsibility for summer session publicity and public relations; 16% indicated since 1982 the responsibility had increased; 4% indicated a decrease, and 42% reported no change in responsibility. Viewing the data, one can determine the five major predominant responsibilities of summer session administrators were reported as:

Editing the summer session bulletin
Cancelling classes because of low enrollment
Setting policy on minimum class size
Publicity and public relations
Preparing the institutional budget

TABLE 4

PERCENT BY MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY AND CHANGE SINCE 1982

Type of Responsibility	With Major Responsibility	Change Since 1982[a]		
		Increase	Decrease	Same
Publicity and public relations	62	16	4	42
Edit summer session bulletin	69	12	2	52
Submit annual report	52	4	1	46
Prepare instructional budget	59	9	2	46
Establish fees and tuition	23	2	1	20
Authorize funds for dropouts	37	3	2	31
Set policy on minimum class size	64	10	2	51
Appoint visiting faculty	39	4	3	31
Determine salaries for visiting faculty	41	4	1	35

Cancel classes because of low enrollment	65	8	2	53
Authorize course withdrawals	36	1	2	32
Conduct cost-income analysis	51	8	1	40
Approve or disapprove course offerings	56	10	3	41
Revisions in course offerings	46	5	2	38
Set student maximimum class load	39	6	1	31
Advise on student admission policy	29	3	1	25
Arrange summer graduation exercises	12	2	0	10
Pre- and post-session clinics, workshops, seminars or institutes	26	4	1	21
Monitor drop/add process	39	2	2	34
Student registration procedures	41	3	1	36
Distribute & collect grade sheets	23	2	1	20
Student disciplinary action	10	.5	.5	9
Assign classrooms and facilities	41	5	2	34
Establish on-campus housing policies	6	0	.5	6

[a]Difference between sum of percentages and 100 due to non-response.

Since 1982 greatest increases were reported in the following responsibilities:

Publicity and public relations
Editing the summer session bulletin
Setting policy on minimum class size
Approving or disapproving class offerings
Preparing the instructional budget

Most respondents reported no change, and small (4% or less) percentages indicated there had been a decrease of the responsibilities.

In the USA, significantly (.05) larger percentages of summer session directors in non-public than public institutions

indicated they had responsibility for publicity and public relations, approval of course offerings, class cancellations because of low enrollment, revisions in course offerings, editing the summer session bulletin, establishing summer school fees and tuition, authorizing refunds for deposits, authorizing course withdrawals, setting maximum student class load, and advising on student admission policy. No differences were found according to enrollment size, region of location, calendar, control, or summer session organization. Significant differences appeared concerning a few responsibilities by institutional type and between association member and non-member institutions.

A significantly (.05) larger percentage of association member institutions than others (76% compared to 54%) indicated responsibility for publicity and public relations had remained the same, but a larger percentage of non-association members reported that responsibility had increased (38% compared to 19%). Significantly (.05) more non-association member institutions (26%) than members (9%) reported an increased responsibility for cost-income analyses and the holding of pre- and post-session activities (33% compared to 3%).

Significantly (.01) more administrators in Research Universities (100%) than in Comprehensive (87%) or Doctoral Granting (78%) who had responsibility for determining salaries for visiting faculty indicated there had been no change between 1982 and 1984. Responsibility was reported to have decreased in more Doctoral Granting institutions (22%) and to have increased in Comprehensive institutions (13%). The same pattern of change was also significant regarding the establishment of summer session fees and tuition.

Trends in Financial Support and Status

Respondents were queried about trends since 1982 in amount and source of financial support and the status or prestige of the summer session. Although 48% of all respondents indicated the amount of financial support had remained the same, 18% indicated a decrease, and 27% reported an increase; only 7% did not respond. As to sources of support, 83% reported no change; 5% reported a decrease, while 4% reported an increase. Eight percent gave no response. A significantly (.01) larger percentage of USA institutions responding to the question with summer session organized as an integral part of the year round operation than others reported a decrease in funding sources. A significantly (.02) higher percentage of USA private institutions (68%) reported no change than did the public (47%). Larger percentages of public than private institutions reported a decrease (20% compared to 9%) or an increase (33% compared to 23%). Significantly (.01) more Research Universities (19%) than others (0% Doctoral Granting and 2% Comprehensive) reported an increase in sources of financial support, and a larger percentage of Research (8%) and Comprehensive (6%) than Doctoral Granting reported a decrease.

The dollar amount of financial support was significantly (.01) decreased in non-association institutions (24%) compared to members (6%), and it had remained the same in a larger percentage (64%) of member institutions compared to non-members (47%). Increases were reported by similar percentages - 29% and 30%.

Eighteen percent of all institutions reported an increase in summer session status or prestige, and 73% indicated it was unchanged. Four percent reported a decline, and 5% did not respond. There was no difference in trend based on institutional size, regional location, or calendar. As to change in prestige of the summer session, a significantly (.05) larger percentage of association member institutions (29%) than others (13%) reported an increase between 1982 and 1984. A larger percentage (83%) of the non-association members than members (67%) reported no change.

Trends in Enrollments

All institutions

Undergraduate lower division enrollments were reported up in 22% of all institutions, down in 30%, and unchanged in 39%. Nine percent did not reply. Undergraduate upper division enrollments in summer sessions were reported up in 27% of the institutions, unchanged in 47%, and down in 19%. Non-response was 6%. The percentage of undergraduates who were summer term visitors (not seeking a degree there) were reported up in 18% of the institutions, down in 13%, and unchanged in 59%. Ten percent did not give an answer. Graduate enrollments were down in 26% of the institutions, up in 27%, and unchanged in 34%. Thirteen percent did not respond. The greatest fluctuation appeared to be in number of headcount students enrolled; they increased in about four out of every ten institutions and decreased in about the same proportion. Average number of students in the courses remained the same in one-half the institutions, increased in one fourth, and decreased in about one-fifth. The percentage which summer session non-duplicative headcount enrollments were to academic year non-duplicative headcount enrollments was reported up in 18%, down in 16%, and the same in 53%.

USA Institutions

A significant (.01) difference was found among USA public institutions based on institutional size as to change in percentage of undergraduate visitor enrollments. A larger percentage of institutions under 8,000 enrollment (31%) noted an increase, while a larger percentage (22%) of those larger noted a decrease. About the same percentages of each size group indicated the enrollment was the same. There was a significant (.05) difference in change of graduate enrollments in public institutions by institution size. A significantly larger percentage (47%) of the institutions with enrollments under 8,000

headcount students compared to 24% of the larger institutions indicated an increase. A significantly (.05) larger percentage of the larger institutions (43%) than smaller ones (23%) indicated the percentage of graduate enrollments was unchanged between 1982 and 1984.

In private USA institutions, a significantly (.02) larger percentage of smaller institutions (75%) than larger ones (33%) indicated there had been no change in undergraduate upper division enrollments. A larger percentage of larger private institutions (42%) than smaller ones reported there had been an increase (21%). No other changes in enrollments were significantly different based on institutional size.

The only significant difference (.05) found on a regional basis in enrollment trends related to percentage changes in undergraduate upper division enrollments. In the North Central and New England-Middle States regions, there had been greater increases betwen 1982 and 1984 (30% and 32%, respectively) than in the Southern (20%) and Western-Northwestern (6%) regions. In the latter regions larger percentages reported no change. A significantly (.05) larger percentage of non-association members, (51%) than members (31%) reported no change in undergraduate lower division enrollments, and a larger percentage of member institutions (33%) than others (18%) reported an increase. There was a significantly (.01) larger decrease in graduate enrollments of Research (56%) universities than in Doctoral Granting (32%) or Comprehensive (25%), and Comprehensive institutions had the largest increase (41% compared to 4% and 9%).

A significant (.05) difference existed in Research Universities compared to Doctoral Granting and Comprehensive Universities in undergraduate upper-division enrollments. Decreases were reported in Research Universities (40%), Comprehensive (19%), and Doctoral Granting (10%), but increases were reported in 24%, 26%, and 43%, respectively.

Trends in Productivity Measures

The total number of credit hours generated in all institutions was reported down by 34%, up by 40%, and unchanged by 24%. Non-response was 2%. Other indices of summer session productivity are shown in Table 5.

The total number of credit hours and numbers of credit courses offered went up in slightly over one-fourth of all institutions and down in about one-fourth of them. The average number of courses taken by students changed least, up in 9% and 11% down. Numbers of headcount students were reported up in 40%, down in 36%, and unchanged in 21% of the institutions. Average number of students in courses were reported up in 25% and down in 19%. Ratio of summer headcount to academic year was reported up in 18% and down in 16%. Productivity measures were unrelated to institutional type, size, type of control, regional location, or association membership.

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS BY CHANGE

IN PRODUCTIVITY INDICES

Index of Productivity	Change 1982-1984[a] Increase	Same	Decrease
Total number of credit hours offered	27	44	25
Number of courses offered for credit	27	45	24
Number of headcount students	40	21	36
Average number of students in courses	25	50	19
Average number of courses taken	9	71	11
Percent which summer non-duplicative headcount enrollment was to academic year non-duplicative headcount	18	53	16

[a]Difference between sum of percents and 100 due to non-response.

Creative Summer Session Programs

One-third of all respondents indicated that in either or both the 1983 or 1984 summer sessions there were programs and/or activities which could be considered innovative, unique, exemplary, or experimental. Thirty-one percent of the USA respondents (60 institutions) and 50% of the Canadian respondents (5) listed or described such programs. Significantly (.05) more private institutions with headcount enrollments over 8,000 than others reported the presence of such a program; there was no difference among public institutions in this respect.

Programs identified which were deemed to fit those categories are listed below by type of institution.

USA Private Comprehensive Universities and Colleges

"We have a program for new freshman who pay $400 room and activity fee, no tuition for the summer. For the local community students, we have a program whereby they can take up to 12 hours (full-load) for $225. These must be new freshman."

"Jubilant summer -- non-academic course offerings for citizens over 60 years old. Citizens could also sit in a regular college course for one week, if desired. One week workshops for Christian educators. Summer Honors -- early enrollment for high school juniors with GPA greater than 3.0 could enroll for up to 12 hours of college credit for summer term."

"Gerontology, Women's Studies, Human Sexuality"

"The Summer Directed Study Program requires the student to be on campus for the first week. The remainder of the work is completed by correspondence with the instructor during the summer. All courses are taught on this basis. Because of this, the program is limited in the types of courses which are offered. Student enrollment is limited to those students who have a 2.0 or higher GPA.

"Program by the Foreign Language department (go to) Europe; program to (go to) California dealing with the world of television; program for teacher's of gifted students."

"High school junior program -- qualified high school juniors allowed to take 3 hour course free during summer between (their) junior and senior year."

"Overseas business seminars in Russia, Scandinavia, Hawaii; seminars on cultural/ethnic areas of New York city; non-credit offerings in contract work with corporations; non-credit language seminars."

USA Public Comprehensive Universities and Colleges

"A Math-Science Institute was developed for secondary school teachers who are teaching math and/or science without adequate preparation. This involved mathematics, chemistry, biology, physics, and science education. This will be continued in 1985."

"Essentials of Latin: used in place of 090 Composition skills. Offer courses off campus in second home developments in Pocono Mountain area. Offer business & Computer Science courses at night in summer sessions (not done before). Increase the number of home study courses on undergraduate level."

"An Elderhostel program was held in 1984."

"Energy Workshop for Teachers - 3-week intensive 3-hour course. It is funded by the Shell Foundation and incorporates several field trips. Teachers are selected from an application process and are expected to integrate materials into classes at the elementary and secondary level. European Business Tour -- 2 1/2 week 3-credit hour course or participants may be continuing education students. The course visits international business executives and gains a perspective on international management, marketing and finance. Hawaii Comparative Education Series -- 3-week, 3-hour credit course for teachers to gain a multi-cultural and comparative educational perspective. Local Hawaiian cultures and sites used as instructional aid."

"Language Immersion Program; Summer Science Program for high school juniors; minority summer math/science program for high school freshmen; music in the mountains (contemporary American music series); Repertory Theatre."

"ASSET -- a printmaking class for teachers partially funded by State Arts Council; Introduction to Deafness Workshop -- for faculty/staff of college (teaching) basic signing and review problems of deaf students; Ventures in Learning -- for gifted and talented youngsters for 1-week intensive study in various subjects combined with Gifted & Talented workshop for teachers."

"International Logo Institute"

"Boston Spark Medicine Institute; Theatre Arts Program on Nantucket Island; Marine Biology Program on Nantucket Island; Archeology in Boston."

"Going to a 4-day work week, no Friday classes."

"Athens State offers a one-month day term session (June), two 2-week sessions and a full-term night program (June - August). In the one-month term students attend class 2 hours a day, 5 days a week. In the 2-week term, students attend class 4 hours a day, 5 days a week. Night classes meet one night a week for 4 hours for 10 weeks."

"Elderhostel Program; Student Transition; Richmond Area Program for Minorities in Engineering."

"Evening and summer BSN completion program"

"Field school in archeology; Spanish & French Institutes; Summer Transitional Program"

"Specialized honors programs for high school students across the USA 1984-Humanities, 1985-Social Sciences."

"Computer Camp; Suzuki Piano Pedagogy; Instrument Repair for Band Directors"

"Stars Program - Strengthening analytical and reasoning skills for high school students; Score Program - summer computer and recreational enrichment for middle school students; Pre-Engineering Program for high school minority students; Basic Skills Program for middle school students; Computer Enrichment for high school students."

"Attempts have been made to better balance course and program offerings. Direct surveys to students for input."

"Language Program overall. Twenty-one languages offered on intensive basis; A*L*P*S Acquiring Language Production Skills. 1984 - Middle East Mosaic (many courses on Middle East; 9 languages). 1985 - Vlach language."

"A graduate program in Gifted/Talented Teaching."

"Reading Workshop; Wellness-Fitness Workshop; Travel courses"

"Remedial Summer Session II - courses offered for repeaters and new students"

"We planned and conducted a Summer Enrichment Program for children 6-16. This program centered around a theatre production. This production was the vehicle by which we taught math, reading, and creative writing."

"Arts Program at Caumsett State Park - outdoor painting, dancing and choreography. Overseas Programs - Education in Isreal, Kenya, England; Jewish Studies in Jerusalem and Israel; French in France; Geology in Iceland"

"SEED - college program for economically/educationally deprived students. Summer Pre-Freshman Program for native speakers for ESL; Freshman Summer Institute a prefreshman summer program for regular students in need of remediation."

"Intensive courses in sciences allowing pre-professional students to complete 2 semesters work in 8 weeks e.g., GEN BIOL I & II; GEN CHEM I & II; PHYSICS I & II"

"In 1984 we offered 6 special theme courses. Three each centered around two topics; "Excellence in Education; and "Election Year Politics".

"Special Theme Programs -- experimental courses designed by faculty and wrapped around three or four themes selected for the specific summer"

"Elderhostel; Eastern Writers Conference; Stage Combat Workshop; SEA Program for Talented Children"

"Institute for elementary school teachers of math, science and computers"

"For the first time we have offered evening classes in the summer compressed time periods. Health Risk Appraisal for four evenings (T, TH - 5:30-9:30) for 1 semester hour credit"

"Summer program designed to acquaint highly talented high school female students with academic programs in engineering and technology"

"In 1983, genealogy weekend workshop (credit and non-credit) and festival in conjunction with State Genealogical Society Annual Meeting - 90 credit students/77 non-credit students, over 600 attending conference. Workshop directed by visiting professor with staff of over 30 genealogical specialists."

"Conference and Seminars; special group institutes; non-credit offerings"

"Initiated summer session night classes; classes extended over both of two summer sessions"

USA Doctoral Granting (Public and Private)

"SMU at the International Conference on Population - Mexico City, 1984"

"Ethical and Legal Issues in Counseling -- Therapy with Children; Reading and the Gifted Student; Simulated Materials Week for Elementary and Secondary School Administrators; Censorship in Literature; The Machine of America; Integrating Asia Studies in HS Curriculum; Science, Religion and Imagination; Career Development -- Getting What You Want; Drug and Alcohol Counseling; The Parent Connection -- Strategies for Success in the Classroom; Educating the Alienated and Disruptive Student; and much more."

"College Excellence Workshop - 2 evenings; 2 hour workshop for college bound achievers who intend to maintain their high level of performance"

"College For Youth - enrichment course for students, pre-school through high school, who are in a regular or gifted school curriculum during the school year"

"Western Arts Music Festival which included a symposium entitled `America Arts & Humanities - Technology Today´. Conference on written and spoken English in order to improve instruction of English. Environmental Science Education Programs in the mountains - includes the Camp in the West Biotropical Field Station work. Living History Program at Historical Ft. Laramie (Oregon Trail Fort)"

"Use four-day class schedule which allows students to catch their breath in fast paced summer terms. Also, saves on costs of air-conditioning"

"Program START - an opportunity for low achievers in high school to become qualified for collegiate admission as a result of improved performance in academic subjects during an intensive 10 week instructional program."

USA Research Universities (Public and Private)

"Summer Abroad in Paris - Began in 1983 6-week program and have continued with it. Courses are taught in English. Growth = 37 first year; 58 third year (which was a deliberate cap). Astronomy program in Mount Crested Butte, Colorado"

"Shipwreck Archeology; Advertising: Creative Writing & Design; Pornography & Obscenity in the Mass Media; Sports Journalism; Improvisation & Role Playing: Accents & Dialects; Moral Issues in Clinical Psychology & Psychiatry; Pleasure & Anxiety; Quick & Dirty Statistics: Techniques & Tables; Right Brain Evaluation/Revolution; and the Musler Education Series"

"Special programs in a) fine arts for academically talented junior/senior high school students, b) Italy, England, Gulf Coast, c) marine science workshops for teachers, d) Anthropology Digs in Israel, e) Computer science for teachers, f) Fresh Water Shrimp Seminars, g) Enology - wine growing workshop, h) Catfish - Farm Raised Catfish Workshop, i) Computerized Farm Management Programs, etc."

"The American West Program at CSU had been and continues to be innovative and exciting. This year features "Dust Bowl Days" and will use this as a springboard for a series of summer session programs on American agriculture. In addition, we have several other Western themes in development."

"Some new programs offered in the College of Architecture and Urban Planning aimed at teaching the use of microcomputers to professionals in the field"

"Distinguished Visiting Professors Program (usually two visitors each summer); Farrand/Sewall Supper Program (designed to give freshman an early start at CU-Boulder; Mountain Research Station (EPO Biology and Geography class taught in the mountains at 9,500 ft. altitude and close to the Continental Divide; Music Theatre Festival (Gilbert & Sullivan productions); Shakespeare in production; Writing about Literature Program (Elissa Guralnick and Paul Levitt, Department of English)"

Canadian Universities

"University Preparation Program for Native American students; Environmental Education Institute - an experimental program conducted off campus; Music Education Workshop - includes well known musicians, university students, junior and senior high students working in various areas such as Jazz & Swing Choir, Percussion, Conducting and culminates in a concert"

"Summer Scholastic - program for teachers of gifted children; Summer Graduate Education Program - Master´s program for teacher´s remote from campus"

"Mini-University - Department of Athletics and Recreation combined with academic departments to present non-credit programs of academic substance (e.g. Chemistry, English, Computing) with sports and sport skills for children and teenagers. Excellent recruitment vehicle as well as profit generator and student jobs generator"

"University Preparation Program - six-week for Native American Studies; Visual Arts Program - experimental program based on six visiting instructors who were high profile Canadian artists"
"Summer Science Program for high school students (non-degree); Interpreter Training for the Hearing Impaired (non-degree); Second Language Institutes (degree and non-degree); Environmental Education (degree for teachers)"

SECTION 3

COMPARATIVE DATA ON TRENDS

Introduction

During the 1982 study, study participants were asked to predict what changes would occur in the future regarding selected characteristics of summer sessions. Data from both studies are presented in this section for only institutions holding association membership (WASSA or NAASS) and for the total group of 1985 study respondents, both Canadian and USA.

Productivity Indices - Curriculum

Shown in Table 6 are the percentages of USA and Canadian respondents holding WASSA or NAASS membership who indicated change which had occurred between 1978 and 1981 and their prediction for 1982-85. Shown also are the changes reported between 1982 and 1984 by the 1985 sample of USA institutions holding association membership as well as for all USA and Canadian institutions.

Viewing Table 6 one can see, for example, that the largest percentage (68%) of USA membership respondents in the sample reported an increase in number of credit hours generated in summer term between 1978-81. The largest percentage (44%) indicating a category of expected change indicated number of credit hours were unchanged between 1982 and 1984, but the largest percentage of the 1985 membership sample (47%) indicated there had been an increase. The largest percentage of respondents from all USA institutions (40%) also indicated there had been an increase. One can see too that the largest percentage of respondents from Canadian institutions holding association membership (50%) indicated the number of credit hours generated between 1978 and 1981 had remained unchanged, but the largest percentage (67%) predicted an increase between 1982 and 1985. In 1985, 60% of the respondents from all Canadian institutions indicated there had indeed been an increase. Other data in both Tables 6 and 7 are to be read and interpreted in the same fashion.

As can be seen, data in these tables will permit a comparison between the change predicted by a sample of USA association member respondents in 1982 and a report by another 1985 sample as to change which did occur between 1982 and 1984. Data also permit a comparison between predicted and reported change between USA association members and change reported by respondents from a sample of all USA universities and colleges. Comparisons can be made also between predicted change by 1982 Canadian membership institutions and reported change by all 1985 institutions.

TABLE 6

PERCENT CHANGE REGARDING CURRICULUM PRODUCTIVITY MEASURES

Index of Productivity and Group	Change 1978-81			Expected Change 1982-85			Reported Change 1982-84		
	De-crease	Same	In-crease	De-crease	Same	In-crease	De-crease	Same	In-crease
Number of credit Hours Generated									
USA Assn. Mem. Sample (1982)	17	15	68	29	44	27			
USA Assn. Mem. Sample (1985)							33	22	47
1985 all USA							36	24	40
Canadian Mem.	17	50	33	--	33	67			
1985 all Canadian							10	30	60
Number of Credit Hours Offered									
USA Assn. Mem. Sample (1982)	22	27	51	30	46	24			
USA Assn. Mem Sample (1985)							25	51	25
1985 all USA							27	46	27
Canadian Mem.	--	50	50	--	50	50			
1985 All Canadian							10	50	40
Number of Credit Courses Offered									
USA Assn. Mem. Sample (1982)	26	38	36	26	47	27			
USA Assn. Mem. Sample (1982)							23	51	26
1985 all USA							26	47	27
Canadian Mem.	--	57	43	--	43	57			
1985 All Canadian							20	40	40

Predicted and Reported Change

One can observe that the largest percentages of 1982 USA membership respondents predicted there would be no change in number of summer session credit hours offered and the number of credit courses offered, and the largest percentages of both USA membership and all institutional respondents indicated there had been no change between 1982 and 1984. However, the largest percentage of USA association members selecting a change category predicted there would be no change in number of credit hours generated, but the largest percentages of respondents from membership institutions and from all USA institutions indicated there had been an increase between 1982 and 1984. Increases in number of credit hours generated and number of credit hours offered had been reported for 1978-81 by USA association members (68% and 51%, respectively). Number of credit hours offered were reported unchanged for this period by 38% and to have increased by 36%.

Two thirds of the Canadian respondents from member institutions predicted an increase in number of credit hours generated, and 60% of the respondents from all institutions in 1985 indicated there had been an increase during the 1982-84 period. As to number of credit hours offered, Canadian association members were equally divided between predicting an increase or no change, but the largest percentage of respondents from all institutions (50%) indicated there was no change between 1982 and 1984. The largest percentage of Canadian member institutions (57%) predicted an increase in number of credit courses offered, but 40% each of the respondents of all Canadian universities in 1985 reported there was either no change or an increase.

Productivity Indices - Enrollments

Shown in Table 7 are data on change reported in the period 1978-1981, the predicted change 1982-1985, and the reported change 1982-1984. Changes relate to number of headcount students, average number of students, average number of courses taken by students and ratio of summer non-duplicative enrollment to enrollment in the other part of the year.

It can be seen that the largest percentage of USA association members (59%) indicated the ratio of summer non-duplicative enrollments to other term non-duplicative enrollments had remained unchanged between 1978 and 1981, were predicted to remain unchanged during 1982-85 (51%), and were reported to have remained unchanged between 1982-84 by 57% and 61%, respectively, of the USA association members and all USA institutions studied. While the largest percentage of Canadian respondents (60%) reported an increase for 1978-81, the largest percentage (71%0 predicted no change for 1982-85, and the largest percentage (67%) reported no change for 1982-84.

TABLE 7

PERCENT CHANGE REGARDING ENROLLMENT PRODUCTIVITY MEASURES

Index of Productivity and Group	Change 1978-81			Expected Change 1982-85			Reported Change 1982-84		
	De-crease	Same	In-crease	De-crease	Same	In-crease	De-crease	Same	In-crease
% of Summer non-duplicative HC was to other term non-duplicative enrollment									
USA Assn. Mem. Sample (1982)	6	59	34	18	51	31			
USA Assn. Mem. Sample (1985)							16	57	27
1985 all USA							20	61	19
Canadian Mem.	20	20	60	--	70	29			
1985 all Canadian							--	67	33
No. of Headcount Students									
USA Assn. Mem. Sample (1982)	18	15	67	25	42	33			
USA Assn. Mem. Sample (1985)							39	16	45
1985 all USA							39	23	39
Canadian Mem.	--	33	67	--	29	71			
1985 all Canadian							10	--	90
Av. No. Students in Courses									
USA Assn. Mem. Sample (1982)	8	42	50	13	50	37			
USA Assn. Mem Sample (1985)							21	49	30
1985 all USA							21	55	24
Canadian Mem.	14	43	43	14	29	57			
1985 all Canadian							10	20	70
Av. No. of Courses Taken									
USA Assn. Mem. Sample (1982)	16	49	35	21	53	25			
USA Assn. Mem. Sample (1985)							19	69	12
1985 all USA							12	78	10
Canadian Mem.	17	33	50	--	57	43			
1985 all Canadian							11	78	11

USA association members reported an increase in number of headcount students between 1978 and 1981 (67%), predicted no change 1982-85 (42%), and reported an increase between 1982-84 (45%). However, among all USA institutions 39% reported a decrease, and 39% reported an increase. Canadian association members indicated there had been an increase in number of head count students in summer sessions for 1978-81 (67%), predicted an increase for 1982-85 (71%), and 90% of all institutions indicated there had been an increase between 1982 and 1984.

The largest percentage of USA membership institutions (50%) indicated there had been an increase for 1978-81 in average number of students in courses and predicted the number would be unchanged for 1982-85 (50%), while the largest percentages of both USA association members (49%) and all USA institutions studied (55%) indicated there had been no change between 1982 and 1984. An equal percentage of Canadian member respondents (43%) indicated that the average number of students in courses had been unchanged or had increased for 1978-81, but 57% predicted an increase for 1982-85. Seventy percent of all Canadian university respondents indicated there had been an increase between 1982 and 1984.

In 1982, the largest percentage of USA association members (49%) indicated there had been no change for 1978-81 in the average number of courses taken by students, and 53% predicted no change for 1982-85. Both USA association members (69%) and all USA respondents (78%) indicated there was no change for 1982-84. Respondents from Canadian members institutions (50%) indicated there had been an increase in the average number of summer session courses taken by students for 1978-81, and 57% predicted no change for 1982-85; 78% of all universities indicated no change had, in fact, occurred during 1982-84.

Among USA institutions, respondent predictions made in 1982 were correct for 3 of the 4 items, and Canadian respondents correctly predicted change in all four respects. There were greater increases reported by USA association members for 1982-84 than USA association members had predicted, but among all USA universities of the types studied there were decreases and unchanged enrollments in more institutions than had been predicted.

Change in Financial Conditions

Data presented in Table 8 relate to changes in the dollar amount and sources of financial support. Respondents of USA membership institutions were about evenly divided (38% compared to 40%) as to whether the dollar amount had been unchanged or increased between 1978-81. The largest percentage (40%) predicted no change for 1982-84, and a majority of both members (64%) and all respondents of USA institutions (54%) indicated no change had occurred for 1982-84.

TABLE 8

PERCENT BY CHANGE REGARDING FINANCIAL CONDITIONS

Indexes of Change by Group	Change 1978-81			Expected Change 1982-85			Reported Change 1982-84		
	De-crease	Same	In-crease	De-crease	Same	In-crease	De-crease	Same	In-crease
USA Assn. Mem. Sample (1982)	21	38	40	35	40	25			
USA Assn. Mem. Sample (1985)							6	64	30
USA Total							17	54	29
Canadian Assn. Members	14	29	57	14	43	43			
1985 all Canadian							50	20	30
Sources of Financial Support									
USA Assn. Mem. Sample (1982)	8	76	16	21	64	15			
USA Assn. Mem. Sample (1985)							4	87	9
USA Total							5	90	5
Canadian Assn. Members	--	86	14	--	100	--			
1985 all Canadian							--	100	--

In this regard the largest percentage (57%) of Canadian member respondents indicated an increase in dollar amount of support for 1978-81 but were divided on whether there would be no change or an increase expected during 1982-85 (43% each). One-half of the respondents from all Canadian universities indicated a decrease had occurred between 1982 and 1984.

Both USA and Canadian member respondents indicated that for 1978-81, sources of financial support had been unchanged (76% and 86%, respectively). A majority of each (64% USA and 100% Canadian) group predicted no change beyond 1982, and the largest percentages of both USA member as well as all institutions and all Canadian universities reported no change between 1982 and 1984.

Predictions from USA institutions were accurate in both instances, but Canadian institutions apparently experienced unforseen decreases in dollar amounts available since 1982 for summer sessions.

Organizational Structure Change

Between 1978 and 1981 change in the organizational structure for summer session was reported in 9% of the USA and none of the Canadian association membership institutions. In 1982, change was being studied in 7% of the USA member institutions, and changes were definitely contemplated in 7%, while the matter was reported under study in 14% of the Canadian member institutions.

In fact, 24 percent of the USA membership institutional respondents reported there had been an administrative reorganization affecting the organizational placement of administration and responsibility for the summer session since 1982. This was the case for 20% of all USA institutions and for 10% of all Canadian universities. Obviously more change occurred among USA institutions in this respect than had been anticipated.

Change in Functioning

In 5% of the USA member institutions both in 1982 and 1985 and in no Canadian university the office was reported to take primary responsibility for developing the summer session academic program.

Coordination of programs developed by instructional units was the mode of operation reported in 1982 by 29 and 42 percents, respectively, of USA and Canadian member universities. In 1985, 30% of the USA association members and 25% of all USA institutions reported this mode of operation. Ten percent of all Canadian institutions reported this mode.

In 1982, 34 and 28 percentages, respectively, of USA and Canadian universities were reported to use a combination of both cooperation and coordination, while in 1985 the reported percentages were 30% and 50% respectively for USA and Canadian association members. The combination mode was found in 28% of all USA institutions studied in 1985.

No change was apparent in USA institutions and the apparent change in Canadian universities from 28% to 50% using a combination mode may reflect a real change, or it may reflect a difference in how respondents reported on this matter.

SECTION 4

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Introduction

A summary of findings is given in this section for summer session organization, mode of office functioning and leadership, enrollments, philosophical attachments, finance, programs, productivity measures, program creativity, and significant differences associated with size, association membership, control, organizational structure, type, and location. Although every response was analyzed by association with such factors as institutional size, type, association membership, geographic location, control, and summer session organization, only statistically significant (.05 level or higher) findings have been reported and summarized.

General Characteristics of Respondents

1. Most institutions (Canadian 70%; USA 88%) enrolled 14,000 or fewer headcount students at the main campus. About 61% of the USA and 20% of the Canadian respondents were in institutions of 8,000 or less. In the USA, the largest percentage of universities with over 8,000 headcount were in the North Central area, and the largest percentage of private institutions with that level of headcount enrollment were in the New England, Middle States and Southern regions.

2. Of all universities, 71% were on a semester calendar, 14% on a quarter system, 3% on a trimester system, 8% on a 4-1-4 system, and 3% on some other system. Significantly more USA public than private universities were on a semester or quarter system.

3. Largest percentages of USA WASSA and NAASS members were from the North Central, New England, Western, and Northwestern areas.

Philosophical Foundations

4. Ninety-three percent of the institutions reported having an institutional role and mission statement for the main campus, and 90% had been adopted/approved by the governing board. USA institutions more likely than others to have a role and mission statement for the campus are over 8,000 headcount enrollment, publicly controlled, and classified as a comprehensive college or university.

5. Only 21% reported the existence of a mission and goals statement for the summer session, and only 9% of the institutions had such a statement that had been approved by the institutional community including the central administration. The summer session role and mission statement had been reviewed internally within the past three years in 16% of the institutions reporting. USA universities located in the West and Northwest regions are more likely than those located elsewhere to have written role and mission statements for summer sessions.

6. The summer session operation is included in the by-laws of the institution in about one-third of the institutions. USA institutions located in the Southern and New England-Middle States regions are more likely than those located in other regions to include operation of the summer session in the institutional by-laws.

7. About six out of ten (57%) institutions reported having a written statement of specific policies and operating procedures (rules and regulations) for the summer session. Universities holding membership in either WASSA or NAASS are more likely than non-members to have a written statement of specific policies and operating procedures for the summer session.

8. The presence of a handbook (or other document) containing the mission and goals statement and policies and procedures for summer session was reported by 28% of the respondents.

9. Most important purposes of summer sessions in USA and Canadian universities in rank order were providing courses for degree students, other identifiable groups, and regular academic year students needing to make up deficiencies. Summer session purposes of encouraging the development of experimental offerings, providing summer employment for faculty, providing courses for identifiable groups other than regular degree students, attracting new regular term admissions, and permitting academic year students to make up deficiencies were most likely to be found in public institutions, while better plant utilization and the provision of income for the general institutional budget were purposes most likely found in private USA universities.

Summer Session Organization

10. Summer sessions were organized as a separate entity in 67% of all institutions, and in 26% they were reported to be an integral part of the year-round operation. Significantly more USA universities with semester or quarter systems had summer sessions organized separately from the academic year.

11. Only 19% of the institutions indicated there had been an administrative reorganization since 1982 which affected the organizational placement of summer session administration and responsibility. Change had occurred in 10% of the Canadian and 20% of the USA universities. Significantly more change in USA universities had been in the North Central and Western - Northwestern regions than in other areas.

12. Some summer sessions in USA institutions had become a separate entity administratively (3%) or budgetarily (4%), while 5% had become a separate entity in both respects. In 10% of both Canadian and USA universities, summer session had been combined with another outreach unit such as Continuing Education, Extended Learning or Extension/Public Service. Between 1982 and 1984, administrative centralization for programming had increased in 11% of all institutions, decreased in 6%, and remained the same in 77%.

Leadership

13. The summer session administrator is an ex-officio member of appropriate faculty senate committees, such as those concerned with calendar, budget, academic affairs, etc., in about one-half of the responding institutions. The person chiefly responsible for the summer session in USA institutions was more likely to serve as an ex-officio member of appropriate senate committees, such as academic affairs, calendar, and budget, in public comprehensive institutions with over 8,000 headcount enrollment than in other institutions. Administrators in association member institutions were more likely than others to devote more time to management of summer session both during the regular year and during the summer session.

14. Summer session offices take primary responsibility for the academic program in 5% of the USA institutions, develop programs in cooperation with academic units in 26% of the USA and 40% of the Canadian institutions, and coordinate programs developed by academic units in 25% of USA and 50% of Canadian universities. It is more likely in Research universities than in other types of USA institutions that the summer session academic programs will be developed by instructional units and coordinated by the summer session office, while in Comprehensive institutions it is more likely than in other institutions the programs will be developed in cooperation with the academic units.

15. The median amount of time devoted during the regular year to management of the summer session was 19% for USA and 26% for USA and Canadian universities, respectively. During the

summer session, median time devoted to management by the directors (or persons responsible) was 44% for USA and 49% for Canadian universities, respectively.

16. Although most respondents reported there had been no change since 1982 in summer session administrative responsibilities, greatest increases were reported for (1) publicity and public relations, (2) editing the summer session bulletin, (3) setting policy on minimum class size, (4) approving or disapproving class offerings, and (5) preparing the instructional budget. Only 4% or less indicated there had been a decrease in any of the responsibilities.

Programs

17. Admission requirements for summer session under-graduates were reported to be different from those in effect during the regular academic year in 24% of the institutions. A different standard of admission requirements for summer session than for the other terms were more likely to be found among USA institutions holding membership in either WASSA or NAASS than in other institutions and to be located in the Western and Northwestern regions.

18. About 3 out of every 10 USA universities (31%) and 5 of every 10 Canadian universities (50%) identified or described summer session programs offered in 1983, 1984, or both terms, which were deemed to be innovative, unique, exemplary, or experimental. Such summer programs in USA institutions were more likely to be found in private universities with over 8,000 enrollment than in smaller ones.

19. A portion of the summer session operating budget was used for cultural and social events (such as picnics, dances, lectures, tours, and drama) for students in 40% of all institutions, for graduate assistantships in 23%, public service non-credit programs in 17%, faculty research in 13%, and faculty fellowships in 7%.

20. Summer session student cultural and social activities (such as picnics, dances, and drama) were most likely to be funded in USA universities from a portion of the summer session budget in public universities enrolling less than 8,000 headcount students, except in the North Central region where they were most likely found in larger public institutions, and in universities with summer sessions organized as an integral part of the year round operation rather than as a separate entity.

21. Summer session budget expenditures for faculty fellowships were most likely to be found in USA universities with less than 8,000 headcount enrollment, except in the Southern region and in more public than private institutions.

22. It was most likely that a portion of the summer session operation budget funded graduate assistantships in USA institutions with fewer than 8,000 headcount students, except in the North Central area, in public institutions of the North Central and Southern regions, private universities in the Southern region, and in institutions with summer session organized as an integral part of the year round operation.

23. Public service non-credit programs were most likely found in USA institutions with summer session organized as an integral part of the year round operation.

24. Faculty research was most likely to be supported by the summer session budget in instances where the summer session in USA universities was organized as a separate entity and in institutions situated in the North Central region.

25. Programs designed for special identifiable groups (e.g., senior citizens, alumni, or advanced high school seniors) were most likely to be found in USA institutions where summer session was organized separately from the regular academic year.

Enrollments

26. Ratios of summer session credit enrollments to other term enrollments in USA universities in 1984 were: 1-2 (6%), 1-3 (20%), 1-4 (16%), 1-5 (14%), 1-6 (10%), 1-7 (5%) and higher 14%. Fifteen percent gave no response. In Canadian universities ratios were: 1-3 (40%), 1-4 (10%), 1-5 (30%), 1-7 (10%) and higher (10%). Higher ratios of summer session to regular year credit enrollments in USA institutions were more likely to be found in public institutions (1-2, 1-3) and lower ratios were most likely a characteristic of private institutions.

27. Since 1982, undergraduate lower division enrollments in summer session were up in 22% of all institutions, down in 30%, and unchanged in 39%. Upper division enrollments were up in 27%, down in 19%, and unchanged in 47%. Graduate enrollments were up in 27%, down in 26%, and unchanged in 34%. Undergraduate summer term visitors were up in 18%, down in 13%, and unchanged 59% of the institutions. Increases in USA graduate summer session enrollments were more likely to be found in Comprehensive institutions and

institutions with under 8,000 headcount enrollment; no change most likely occurred in larger institutions; but, declines were most likely in Research universities.

28. Undergraduate summer session lower division enrollment increases were most likely to be found among USA association (WASSA and NAASS) member institutions, while enrollments in others most likely remained unchanged. Greatest percentage increases in summer session undergraduate upper division enrollments most likely occurred in USA universities situated in the North Central and New England-Middle States regions and in Doctoral Granting institutions, while decreases were most likely to have occurred in Research universities.

29. An increase in summer session undergraduate visitors was more likely to have occurred in USA institutions with fewer than 8,000 headcount students, and a decrease was most likely found in larger institutions.

Productivity Measures

30. Between 1982 and 1984, the total number of credit hours and numbers of courses offered for credit in summer session went up in slightly over one-fourth (27%) of all institutions and down in about one-fourth of them (24-25%).

31. Number of headcount summer session students was reported up in 40% of the institutions and down in 36%. The proportion of change in ratios between summer headcount and academic year population was up in 18% and down in 16%.

32. Average number of courses taken changed least with 9% reported up and 11% reported down. Total number of credit hours generated was reported down by 34%, up by 40%, and unchanged by 24%; 2% did not respond.

Funding and Finance

33. The amount of financial support for summer session was reported unchanged in 1984 compared to 1982 in 48% of the institutions, decreased in 18%, and increased in 27%. Since 1982, 83% reported no change in sources of financial support; 5% reported a decrease, and 4% reported an increase. Change in funding sources in the USA since 1982 were most likely to be found in public institutions with increases most likely in Research universities and decreases most likely in institutions where summer sessions were organized as an integral part of the year round operation. While dollar amounts most likely remained unchanged in association member institutions, non-member institutions most likely experienced a decrease.

34. Budgets for the summer session operations were included in the total institutional budget just as for any other operational unit in 79% for all institutions. Association member institutions were less likely than non-members to include the summer session budget as an integral part of the total institutional budget, but the converse was most likely found in public universities of the North Central region.

35. Slightly over one-fifth (21%) of the institutions reported greater dependency on self-support monies for summer session in 1984 than was the case in 1982. Greater dependence on self-support monies for summer session was most likely to be found among USA institutions in the Southern and Western-Northwestern regions and generally among institutions not holding a membership in either WASSA or NAASS.

36. Contingency contracts were used in 74% of the institutions for summer session teaching faculty. About one-fourth of the institutions had made a change since 1982 in the basis for determining summer session faculty salaries. Contingency contracts for summer session faculty in USA universities were most likely to be found in the Southern and New England-Middle States regions and in institutions generally with under 8,000 headcount enrollment.

37. Change in USA universities since 1982 in the basis for determining summer session faculty salaries was most likely to be found in institutions with over 8,000 headcount and in the New England-Middle States region.

38. Most institutions using a portion of the summer session operational budget for graduate assistantships and public service non-credit programs devoted 5% or less for each purpose. Those using a portion of the budget for faculty research devoted 8% - 12% for the purpose.

Administrator Responsibilities

39. The chief summer session administrator in two-thirds of the institutions had authority to allocate budget to academic units within broad institutional guidelines. Authority of the USA summer session administrator to allocate budget to academic units was most likely to exist in public institutions.

40. Responsibility in USA universities for determining summer session faculty salaries or the establishment of tuition and fees most likely decreased for summer session administrators in Doctoral Granting universities, increased in Comprehensive institutions, and remained unchanged in Research universities.

41. No change in responsibility for publicity and public relations was most likely found between 1982 and 1984 in USA association member institutions; however, increased responsibility not only for publicity and public relations but also cost-income analyses and pre- and post-session activities were most likely to exist in non-member institutions.

43. Responsibility for such tasks as establishing publicity and public relations, revising and approving course offering, approving class cancellations, authorizing refunds and course withdrawals, editing the summer session bulletin, establishing fees and tuition and maximum class size, and advising on student admission policy were most likely to be found in USA private rather than public institutions.

Differences Associated with Institutional Size

44. Significant differences associated with size of headcount enrollment in USA universities were the following:

(a) Significantly more institutions with over 8,000 headcount enrollment than others had an institutional role and mission statement for the campus, and the person chiefly responsible for the summer session was an ex-officio member of appropriate senate committees such as academic affairs, calendar or budget.

(b) Change in the basis for summer session faculty teaching salaries since 1982 was found in significantly more public institutions with over 8,000 headcount enrollment.

(c) Percent of summer session undergraduate visitors had decreased in public institutions over 8,000.

(d) Significantly more institutions over 8,000 enrollment in the North Central region than other institutions supported student cultural and social activities and graduate assistantships from a portion of the summer session budget.

(e) Significantly more private universities with over 8,000 enrollment than other private institutions reported having an exemplary, innovative, unique, or experimental summer program.

(f) Significantly more institutions with a headcount enrollment of 8,000 or less had experienced an increase in enrollments of graduates and undergraduate summer

visitors. A significantly larger percentage of larger institutions reported no change in graduate enrollment between 1982 and 1984.

(g) More institutions under 8,000 headcount enrollment than larger ones used contingency contracts for summer session teaching faculty.

(h) Except in the North Central region, significantly more institutions with 8,000 or less enrollment used a portion of the summer session operating budget for student cultural and social activities and for graduate assistantships. Support of faculty fellowships were found in smaller institutions also, except in the Southern region where they were found in significantly more institutions with over 8,000 enrollment.

Differences Associated with Association Membership

45. Significant differences among USA universities associated with WASSA or NAASS membership were as follows:

(a) Summer session administrators in institutions holding membership in NAASS or WASSA devoted significantly more time to summer session management during the regular year and during the summer session than did administrators in other institutions.

(b) Significantly more association members than non-members had a written statement of specific policies and operating procedures (rules and regulations) for the summer session.

(c) Significantly fewer association members than non-members included the summer session budget as an integral part of the total institutional budget.

(d) Significantly fewer association members than non-members experienced greater dependency on self-support monies in 1984 than they did in 1982.

(e) Significantly more association members than non-members reported having different admission standards for summer session than for the other academic terms.

(f) Significantly more association members than non-members indicated responsibility for publicity and public relations in 1984 were the same as in 1982, and a lower percentage indicated that responsibility had increased. Significantly more non-association members reported increased responsibility for cost-analyses and the conduct of pre- and post-session activities.

(g) Significantly more non-association members than members reported the dollar amount of financial support had decreased, and the amount had remained the same in 1984 as in 1982 in a significantly larger percentage of member institutions.

(h) A significantly larger percentage of association members than non-members reported an increase in the status or prestige of summer session since 1982.

(i) A significantly larger percentage of member institutions than non-members reported an increase in undergraduate lower division enrollments, and significantly more non-association member universities reported no change.

Differences Associated with Control

46. Significant differences associated with control -- public or private in USA institutions -- were the following:

(a) More public than private institutions were reported to have a role and mission statement for the campus; and in significantly more with enrollments over 8,000, the summer session administrators served ex-officio on appropriate senate committees.

(b) Public institutions placed greater emphasis than did private ones on the purposes of providing courses for identifiable groups other than regular degree students, providing summer employment for faculty, attracting new admissions for the regular year, permitting regular academic year students to make up deficiencies, and encouraging the development of experimental offerings. Significantly more non-public than public institutions emphasized the purposes of better utilizing plant facilities and providing income for the general institutional budget.

(c) The chief summer session administrator in significantly more public than private universities had authority to allocate budget to academic units within broad institutional guidelines.

(d) A significantly larger percentage of public than private universities supported faculty fellowships and student cultural and social activities with a portion of the summer session operational budget.

(e) Summer session directors in significantly more private than public institutions had responsibility for publicity and public relations, approval of course offerings, cancellations of low enrollment classes, revisions of course offerings, editing the summer session bulletin, establishing summer session fees and tuition, authorizing refunds for deposits and course withdrawals, setting maximum student class load, and advising on student admission policy.

(f) A significantly larger percentage of private than public institutions indicated there had been no change since 1982 in sources of funding support, and significantly larger percentages of public institutions reported either an increase (33%) or a decrease (20%).

(g) A significantly larger percentage of public than private institutions reported summer session credit enrollment ratios to regular year enrollments of 1-2 and 1-3, but a larger percentage of private than public institutions reported ratios of 1-6, 1-7, or lower.

Differences Associated with Organizational Structure

47. Significant differences associated with summer session organization in USA institutions were as follows:

(a) A larger percentage of separately organized summer sessions than others offered special programs for selected groups, e.g., alumni, senior citizens, etc., not regularly offered during the academic year.

(b) Larger percentages of universities with summer sessions organized as an integral part of year-round operation rather than as separate entities allocated a portion of the summer session budget for public service non-credit programs, graduate assistantships, and student cultural or social events.

(c) Faculty research was supported by a portion of the summer session budget in a significantly larger percentage of institutions with summer session organized as a separate entity.

(d) A decrease in funding sources was found in a significantly larger percentage of institutions with summer session as an integral part of year-round operation than as a separate entity.

Differences Associated with Institutional Type

48. Statistically significant differences associated with USA institutional type were as follows:

(a) The summer session office coordinated summer session academic programs developed by instructional units in a significantly larger percentage of Research universities, while programs were developed in cooperation with academic units in significantly more Comprehensive institutions.

(b) More Comprehensive institutions than other types reported a written campus role and mission statement and summer session administrators in significantly more of them than in other types served on appropriate faculty senate committees such as academic affairs, budget, and calendar.

(c) Significantly more administrators with responsibility for determining faculty salaries in Research universities than in other types of universities indicated there had been no change between 1982 and 1984. Responsibility for this had significantly decreased in Doctoral Granting institutions and increased in Comprehensive institutions. The same significant pattern existed regarding the establishment of summer session fees and tuition.

(d) Significantly more Research universities than other types reported an increase in sources of financial support since 1982.

(e) Graduate enrollments declined in a significant percentage of Research universities compared to other types and increased significantly in Comprehensive universities between 1982 and 1984 compared to enrollments in other types of institutions.

(f) Decreases since 1982 in upper division under-graduate enrollments were significantly greater in Research universities than in Comprehensive or Doctoral Granting institutions, but significant increases were reported by Doctoral Granting institutions.

Differences Associated with Regional Location

49. Significant differences in USA institutions associated with regional locations were as follows:

(a) More public institutions in the West and Northwest regions than in other regions had written role and mission statements for summer sessions.

(b) Significantly more private institutions in the Southern and New England-Middle States regions than in other regions included operation of the summer session in the institutional bylaws.

(c) Significantly larger percentages of North Central region universities than those in other regions included the summer session budget in the total institutional budget just as for any other operational unit. In this region, this practice was found in more public institutions than in public institutions of other regions.

(d) Larger percentages in the New England-Middle States region than in other regions used contingency contracts for summer session teaching faculty, and in this region significantly more institutions using these contracts had enrollments under 8,000.

(e) A significantly larger percentage of public universities in the Southern and New England-Middle States regions than in other regions used contingency contracts for summer session teaching faculty.

(f) Change since 1982 in the basis for determining summer session faculty salaries was greater among public universities in the New England-Middle States region than in other regions.

(g) A larger percentage of universities in the Southern and Western - Northwestern regions than in other regions reported greater dependency on self-support monies for summer sessions in 1984 than in 1982.

(h) In the Western and Northwestern region, more than in other regions, undergraduate admission requirements were reported to be different for summer session than for the regular academic year.

(i) Public universities in the North Central and Southern regions and private universities in the Southern region supported more than universities in other regions the funding of graduate assistantships from a portion of the summer session budget.

(j) Faculty research was supported by a portion of the summer session budget in significantly more North Central region institutions than those in other regions.

(k) In the North Central and New England-Middle States regions there were significantly greater increases in undergraduate upper division enrollments than in other regions between 1982 and 1984.

Conclusions

Based upon the findings, the following conclusions seem warranted.

General

1. Differences do exist in the characteristics of summer sessions which are associated with institutional headcount enrollment size, type of control, regional location, membership in a summer session association, and organizational structure of the summer session.

2. Respondents in 1982 from association member institutions were able to predict very accurately future trends in productivity measures, enrollment, finance and functioning with the exception of Canadian institutions which experienced an unexpected decrease in the amount of funding for summer session programs. An area of surprise was the unanticipated changes in organizational structure in USA institutions.

3. The nature of the summer session is clearly different from the academic year program in many institutions with many variations noted. Summer programs are not usually perceived as being an integral part of the total institution's program, often have different admission requirements, and are tailored to meet the interests of many and diverse audiences. Noticeable differences are found regarding the emphasis on innovative and experimental offerings, research and service activities, scheduling, management, and other operational features. A general conclusion suggested is that there is diversity of programming and management style with need for greater emphasis on immediate needs of students and effective marketing strategies.

Conceptual and Philosophical Underpinnings of Summer Session

4. Review of literature reveals that there is no systematic and analytic approach to setting the course of summer schools. Summer sessions have evolved in an unsystematic

manner characterized by great ambiguities as to role, purpose, and function. Reasons for existence seem to be an ever evolving mixture of politics, economics, academic needs and chance.

5. Many institutions are operating summer session programs without a clear statement of role and purpose and the degree to which summer sessions are integrated with the ongoing institution's program, and represented in the institution's central purpose(s) cannot always be discerned. The data clearly show great variation among institutions as related to type, size, and geographic location.

6. The purposes expressed for summer session often subscribe to need for faculty employment, use of resources, and experimentation as central purposes of the programs. Meeting the educational and program needs of students may not receive top priority in the perceptions of central administration in terms of institutional role and purposes of summer sessions.

Leadership

7. Leadership roles of summer session administrators are best characterized as either cooperative or coordinating with primary emphasis on management responsibilities such as budget allocation, calendar, bulletin editing and publication, publicity, and decisions about course cancellations. While administrators often encourage and participate in creative and experimental programming, they do not seem to be involved in major policy issues and decisions within the university or in setting the course of higher education. The lack of status, prestige, and centrality was also noted in the historical review of summer session in higher education.

8. Given the opportunity to list innovative, unique, experimental or exemplary programs, a minority of institutions responded. It might be concluded that such programs do not represent the mainstream of purpose and plan in many summer sessions, particularly among certain types of institutions.

9. Dimensions of summer programs emphasizing faculty fellowships and faculty research are not represented predominantly in most summer programs and tend to be associated with certain types of institutions.

Enrollment

10. Wide variation exists among institutions regarding enrollment fluctuations at lower and upper division undergraduate and graduate levels and they seem to be related to size, type of institution, control, and geographical location.

11. Ratio of summer to academic year enrollment is generally higher in public than private institutions, and lower ratios are most likely to be a characteristic of private schools. This suggests that the manner in which the summer program relates to the institution and the purpose and reason(s) for summer school are identifiably different in the two types of institutions. Other data within this study corroborate this conclusion showing that public school summer sessions are generally larger in relation to the academic year and emphasize student needs to a greater extent. Private institutions accent use of facilities and generation of revenue.

Organization

12. There appears to be a slight trend toward greater centralization of control and consolidation of summer session operations into other administrative units.

Finance

13. Among institutions with summer session organized as a separate entity there appears to be a trend toward greater reliance on self-support monies for operational purposes.

Productivity

14. Success or lack thereof using the productivity measures utilized in this study was not associated with regional location, type of control, calendar, size of institution or association membership. It might be concluded that the "winning combination" is still to be found and, because of the many and diverse needs and goals of summer schools, each may have to evaluate success with its own unique measures of productivity. Indices used in this study were possibly not the proper ones to discriminate among institutions.

Association membership

15. Association membership (WASSA or NAASS) is definitely related to factors such as presence of role and mission statements, status and prestige of summer sessions, enrollment, budget support, and active involvement in management of summer sessions both during the year and in summer. In some instances membership seems to be associated

with a positive effect although causation cannot be concluded. It can be concluded that administrators who are having some kinds of positive effects on summer programs are also members of associations. The possibility for continued leadership through the associations including productive communication networks is indeed a possibility.

Recommendations

Based upon the data presented and conclusions derived, several recommendations seem in order. They are:

1. There is need for continued study and research on the role and mission of summer sessions as related to:

   (a) Philosophical underpinnings.
   (b) Heritage within the higher education system.
   (c) Unique characteristics and potential for serving regular and special program needs.
   (d) Opportunities for development and meeting emerging and future educational goals in higher education.

2. Studies are needed which focus on:

   (a) Other types of colleges and universities not included in this study.
   (b) Nature and characteristics of summer sessions in smaller institutions.
   (c) Specific summer program dimensions such as personnel practices, publicity strategies, and fiscal and management activities.

3. Summer session professional organizations (WASSA, NAASS, et al.) should consider the possibility of developing affiliations with other existing associations in higher education to magnify and communicate potential and existing opportunities of summer sessions.

4. Strategies should be developed for integrating summer session administration with the central university structure including the shaping of institutional policy and the assumption of leadership functions.

5. Existing summer session associations should study and develop leadership strategies for the general improvement and management of summer programs. Special workshops and training programs should be encouraged in leadership development.

6. In-depth studies are needed of innovative, exemplary experimental, and unique programs, and ways should be developed for validating and sharing such practices.

7. Future research should help to develop a more complete data base relating to summer sessions. This should include a variety of study approaches such as:

   (a) Basic descriptive studies
   (b) Case studies
   (c) Experimental studies
   (d) Evaluation and validation studies

8. Through long-term funding strategies, summer session organizations should encourage the development of informative papers, a monograph series, and/or a regularly published journal related to the field.

9. Cooperative research projects should be encouraged with other significant existing agencies such as national or state-level continuing education associations and research associations in higher education, e.g., NUCEA, AERA, AHE.

10. Selected aspects of the present study should be replicated periodically to discern trends in the administration and operation of summer sessions.

REFERENCES

Dickerman, W. B. (1945). The historical development of the summer session in higher institutions in the United States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.

Eliot, C. W. (1898). Educational reform. New York: Century.

Eliot, C. W. (1869). The new education. The Atlantic Monthly, 23, 203-220.

Goodspeed, T. W. (1925). The story of the University of Chicago. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Slosson, E. E. (1910). Great American universities. New York: The Macmillan Company.

The Morrill (Land Grant) Act (July 2, 1862) (1863). In G. P. Sanger, ed., The statutes at large, treaties, and proclamations, of the United States of America (Volume XII, pp. 503-5). Boston. Little, Brown and Company.

The Smith Lever Act, May 8, 1914. (1915). The statutes at large of the United States of America (Volume 38, pp. 372-374). Washington DC: Government Printing Office.

Young, R. J. and McDougall, W. P. (1982). Relationships of selected factors to summer session organizational structure. Pullman: Washington State University.

APPENDIX A

SUMMER SESSION INFORMATION SCHEDULE

_____ Institution Type Code

Responses are confidential and will be used for statistical purposes only.

SUMMER SESSION INFORMATION SCHEDULE

PART I - GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL

Directions: Please read each question, then write the number of your answer for each question in the space in front of the question.

____ 1. What was the headcount enrollment for Fall 1984 at the campus where you are located? (Select one)
(1) Less than 3,000
(2) 3,001 - 8,000
(3) 8,001 - 14,000
(4) 14,001 - 20,000
(5) 20,001 - 34,999
(6) 35,000 or more

____ 2. In what regional accrediting association region is your campus located? (Select one)
(1) North Central
(2) Middle States
(3) New England
(4) Southern
(5) Western
(6) Northwestern

____ 3. On what academic calendar does your institution operate? (Select one)
(1) Semester
(2) Quarter
(3) Trimester
(4) 4-1-4
(5) Other: _____

PART II - GENERAL SUMMER SESSION

____ 4. Which general description best fits the summer session at your institution? (Select one)
(1) Integral part of the year around operation of coordinate rank with other academic terms.
(2) Separate from the regular academic year term.
(3) Other: _____

____ 5. Since 1982, has there been an administrative reorganization within your institution which has affected the organizational placement of administration and responsibility for the summer session? (Select one)
(1) Yes (2) No

a. If yes, which of the following occurred regarding summer session organization? (Check (✓) all that apply)
____ (1) Has become a separate entity administratively.
____ (2) Has become a separate entity budgetarily.
____ (3) Combination of (1) and (2) above.
____ (4) Has become combined with the Continuing Education, Extended Learning, and/or other Extension/Public Service Unit.
____ (5) Has become diffused among academic units (schools, departments, or colleges).
____ (6) Has been organized into the College of Arts and Sciences.
____ (7) Has been organized as part of the Graduate School.
____ (8) Has been subsumed under another larger administrative office (e.g., academic affairs, registrar).
____ (9) Other: _____

____ 6. What was the ratio of 1984 summer session credit enrollments to the regular academic year credit enrollments in 1983-1984? (Select one)
(1) 1-2 (2) 1-3 (3) 1-4 (4) 1-5 (5) 1-6 (6) 1-7 (7) Other: _____

____ 7. What percent of the summer session director's time is devoted to management of the summer session during the regular academic year? (Select one)
(1) 90%-100%
(2) 80%-89%
(3) 70%-79%
(4) 60%-69%
(5) 50%-59%
(6) 40%-49%
(7) 30%-39%
(8) 20%-29%
(9) Less than 20%

____ 8. What percent of the summer session director's time is devoted to management of the summer session during the summer session? (Select one)
(1) 90%-100%
(2) 80%-89%
(3) 70%-79%
(4) 60%-69%
(5) 50%-59%
(6) 40%-49%
(7) 30%-39%
(8) 20%-29%
9) Less than 20%

____ 9. In which fashion does the summer session office carry out responsibilities regarding the summer session academic program? (Select one)
(1) Takes primary responsibility for the development of the summer session academic program.
(2) Develops the academic program in cooperation with the departments, schools, and colleges.
(3) Coordinates the academic program which has been developed by departments, schools, or colleges.
(4) Combination of (2) and (3) above.
(5) Other: _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART III - ROLE OF SUMMER SESSION

Directions: Please check (✓) your answers at the right or respond otherwise as indicated.

Check one

10. Does your institution have an institutional Role and Mission statement for the campus where you are located? . . . . . ___ Yes ___ No

    a. If yes, has the campus institutional statement of Role and Mission been adopted/approved by the governing board? . . . . . ___ Yes ___ No

11. Is there a written mission and goals statement for the summer session? . . . . . ___ Yes ___ No

    a. If yes, has the written mission and goals statement for the summer session been approved by the institutional community including the central administration? . . . . . ___ Yes ___ No

    b. Has this role and mission statement been reviewed within the institution within the past three years? . . . . . ___ Yes ___ No

12. Is there a written statement of specific policies and operating procedures (rules and regulations) for summer session? . . . . . ___ Yes ___ No

13. Is the operation of summer session included in the by-laws of the institution? . . . . . ___ Yes ___ No

14. Is there a handbook (or other document) containing the mission and goals statement and the policies and procedures for summer session which can be used to inform deans, departmental chairpersons, or academic unit heads? . . . . ___ Yes ___ No

15. Is the chief administrator of the summer session (Summer Session Director or whatever title is accorded the individual responsible for implementing summer session) an ex-officio member of appropriate faculty senate committees such as those concerned with calendar, budget, academic affairs, etc? . . . . . ___ Yes ___ No

16. Please indicate which of the following are major purposes of summer session on your campus. (Check (✓) all that apply.)

    ___ 1. To provide courses for the institution's regular degree students.

    ___ 2. To provide courses for identifiable groups other than regular degree students.

    ___ 3. To more fully utilize the plant facilities through the summer period.

    ___ 4. To provide summer employment for faculty.

    ___ 5. To attract new admissions to the institution for the regular academic term.

    ___ 6. To provide income for the institution's general budget.

    ___ 7. To encourage and provide a setting for experimental offerings.

    ___ 8. To offer special programs not regularly offered for selected groups such as alumni, senior citizens, etc.

    ___ 9. To permit regular academic year students to make up academic deficiencies.

    ___ 10. Other: _____

17. Among the purposes listed in item 16 above, circle the numbers of three (3) you consider to be most important.

PART IV - OPERATIONAL FEATURES

Directions: Please respond as indicated for each question.

Check one

18. Is the budget for summer session included in the total institutional budget just as for any other operational unit? . . . . . ___Yes ___ No

19. Does the chief administrator (director of summer session) have the authority to allocate budget to academic units within broad budget guidelines of the institution? . . . . . ___Yes ___ No

20. Are the summer session undergraduate admission requirements different than those in effect during the regular academic year? . . . . . ___Yes ___ No

21. Does the summer session budget include some monies for student activities such as cultural or social events (picnics, dances, lectures, readings, tours, drama, etc)? . . . . . ___Yes ___ No

22. Since the 1982 summer session, has there been a change in the basis for determining summer session faculty salaries? . . . . . ___ Yes ___ No

23. Is a portion of the total summer session budget (excluding indirect and/or overhead costs) allocated for graduate assistantships? . . . . . ___ Yes ___ No

    a. If yes, approximately what percent? _____%

24. Is a portion of the total summer session budget (excluding indirect and/or overhead costs) allocated for public service non-credit programs? . . . . . ___ Yes ___ No

    a. If yes, approximately what percent? _____%

25. Is a portion of the total summer session budget (excluding indirect and/or overhead costs) allocated for faculty research? . . . . . ___ Yes ___ No

    a. If yes, approximately what percent? _____%

26. Are faculty fellowships made available from the summer session budget? . . . . . ___ Yes ___ No

27. Is use made of contingency contracts (contingent on adequate class enrollments) for summer session teaching faculty? . . . . . ___ Yes ___ No

28. In 1984, was there a greater dependency on self-support monies for summer session than in 1982? . . . . . ___ Yes ___ No

PART V - SELECTED RESPONSIBILITIES AND CHANGE

29. For which items do you have major direct responsibility, and how has this responsibility changed since 1982?

Directions: You are asked to do two things: (1) first, check (✓) on the left only the items for which you have major (more than anyone else) direct responsibility; (2) second, check (✓) on the right opposite each major responsibility how the amount of responsibility has changed since 1982.

A. Check (✓) all that apply			B. Check (✓) nature of change since 1982		
			(1) Increased	(2) Decreased	(3) Remained Same
___	(01)	Publicity and public relations . . . . . (01)	___	___	___
___	(02)	Set policy on the minimum class size permitted . (02)	___	___	___
___	(03)	Approve or disapprove course offerings . . . . . (03)	___	___	___
___	(04)	Cancel classes because of low enrollment . . . . (04)	___	___	___
___	(05)	Revisions in course offerings . . . . . (05)	___	___	___
___	(06)	Edit summer session bulletin . . . . . (06)	___	___	___
___	(07)	Appoint visiting faculty . . . . . (07)	___	___	___
___	(08)	Determine salaries for visiting faculty . . . . . (08)	___	___	___
___	(09)	Assign classrooms and facilities . . . . . (09)	___	___	___
___	(10)	Prepare instructional budget . . . . . (10)	___	___	___
___	(11)	Establish summer school fees and tuition . . . . (11)	___	___	___
___	(12)	Establish on-campus housing policies . . . . . (12)	___	___	___
___	(13)	Authorize refunds for dropouts . . . . . (13)	___	___	___
___	(14)	Student registration procedures . . . . . (14)	___	___	___
___	(15)	Monitor drop/add process . . . . . (15)	___	___	___
___	(16)	Distribute & collect grade sheets . . . . . (16)	___	___	___
___	(17)	Authorize course withdrawals . . . . . (17)	___	___	___
___	(18)	Set student maximum class load . . . . . (18)	___	___	___
___	(19)	Advise on student admission policy . . . . . (19)	___	___	___
___	(20)	Student disciplinary action . . . . . (20)	___	___	___
___	(21)	Arrange summer graduation exercises . . . . . (21)	___	___	___
___	(22)	Submit annual report . . . . . (22)	___	___	___
___	(23)	Conduct cost-income analysis . . . . . (23)	___	___	___
___	(24)	Pre- and post-session clinics, workshops, seminars, or institutions . . . . . (24)	___	___	___

30. What changes have been observed since the 1982 summer session on the following conditions: (Check (✓) opposite each item.)

			Change 1982 - 1984		
			(1) Decrease	(2) Same	(3) Increase
(01)	Total number of credit hours generated	(01)	___	___	___
(02)	Total number of credit hours offered	(02)	___	___	___
(03)	Number of courses offered for credit	(03)	___	___	___
(04)	Number of headcount students	(04)	___	___	___
(05)	Average number of students in courses	(05)	___	___	___
(06)	Average number of courses taken by students	(06)	___	___	___
(07)	Percentage which summer non-duplicative headcount enrollment is of academic year non-duplicative headcount enrollment	(07)	___	___	___
(08)	Percent of undergraduates who are summer term visitors (not seeking a degree here)	(08)	___	___	___
(09)	Graduate level enrollments	(09)	___	___	___
(10)	Undergraduate upper division enrollments	(10)	___	___	___
(11)	Undergraduate lower division enrollments	(11)	___	___	___
(12)	Degree of administrative centralization for programming	(12)	___	___	___
(13)	Dollar amount of financial support	(13)	___	___	___
(14)	Sources of financial support	(14)	___	___	___
(15)	Status or prestige of summer session	(15)	___	___	___

PART VI - PROGRAMS

30. In either the 1983 or 1984 or both summer sessions, were there programs and/or activities which you consider to be innovative, unique, exemplary, or experimental? (Check one) ___ Yes ___ No

a. If yes, please identify each of the programs by listing a title or give a sentence description.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Return to:
Dr. Raymond J. Young
Department of Education
Washington State University
Pullman, WA 99164-2110

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP!

APPENDIX B

LIST OF COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS

COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS

Research

#*University of Arizona
#*University of California, Los Angeles
#*Colorado State University
#*University of Colorado, Boulder
University of Illinois, Urbana
University of Michigan
*University of Minnesota
*Ohio State University
University of Pittsburgh
University of Texas, Main
*University of Arkansas, Main
*University of Connecticut
Iowa State University
*Kansas State University
*Mississippi State University
University of New Mexico, Main
University of Cincinnati
Oklahoma State University
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
California Institute of Technology
*University of Miami
University of Chicago
John Hopkins University
*Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Princeton University
*New York University
*University of Rochester
*Duke University
*Howard University
*Emory University
Tulane University in Louisiana

Doctoral Granting

University of Alabama
Georgia State University
Ball State University
University of Louisville
*University of Mississippi
University of Southern Mississippi
*University of New Hampshire
*Clemson University
University of South Carolina
North Texas State University
Texas Technological University
University of Wyoming

= WASSA membership; * = NAASS membership.

*Illinois State University
*North Dakota State University
*Miami University
*Memphis State University
Illinois Institute of Technology
*Boston College
Dartmouth College
Fordham University
*Lehigh University
*Southern Methodist University
*University of the Pacific
Clark University

Comprehensive Universities and Colleges

Alabama A&M University
University of Alabama, Birmingham
Arkansas State University, Main
Arkansas Technical University
Henderson State University
*University of Arkansas, Little Rock
*California State University, Northridge
#San Francisco State University
#University of Colorado, Denver
University of Southern Colorado
*Central Connecticut State University
Armstrong State College
Valdosta State College
Chicago State University
*Eastern Illinois University
Southern Illinois University
Indiana University, Purdue, Indianapolis
*University of Northern Iowa
Fort Hays Kansas State University
Murray State University
Grambling State University
McNeese State University
*Nicholls State University
Southeastern Louisiana University
University of New Orleans
*Salisbury State College
*North Adams State College
*Salem State College
Southeastern Massachusetts University
*Central Michigan University
Lake Superior State College
University of Michigan, Dearborn
Mississippi Valley State University
Northwest Missouri State University
Southeast Missouri State University
*University of Nebraska, Omaha

*Rutgers State University
City University of NY, City College
City University of NY, College of Staten Island
City University of NY, Hunter
City University of NY, Lehman
City University of NY, Queens
State University of NY College at Genesco
State University of NY College at Oneonta
State University of NY College at Utica-Rome
*North Carolina A&T
*North Carolina Central University
Minot State College
Central State University, Oklahoma
*Portland State University
*Southern Oregon State College
Slippery Rock State College
South Carolina State College
Winthrop College
Northern State College
University of Tennessee, Martin
Pan American University
Sam Houston State University
Stephen Austin State University
Tarleton State University
Christopher Newport College
Longwood College
*Old Dominion University
Radford College
Virginia State College
West Liberty State College
University of Wisconsin, Superior
Athens State College
Livingston University
*Southern Arkansas University
Georgia College
*University of Maine
Boston State College
*Worcester State College
*Eastern Montana College
Western Montana College
Peru State College
*University of NH, Keene State College
University of NH, Plymouth State College
*State University of NY, Buffalo
State University of NY College at New Paltz
*University of North Carolina, Asheville
*Winston-Salem State University
*East Stroudsburg State College
Mansfield State College

Pennsylvania State University, Behrend College
University of Houston at Clear Lake City
University of Virginia, Clinch Valley College
*Central Washington State University
Bluefield State College
Concord College, West Virginia
LaVerne College
Loyola Marymount University
Pepperdine University
University of Santa Clara
University of New Haven
*Augustana College
Elmhurst College
*Anderson College
*Valparaiso University
*Simmons College
Mercy College of Detroit
Saint Olaf College
*St. Peter's College
University of Albuquerque
College of Saint Rose
Manhattan College
NY Institute of Technology, NY City
Capital University
*Xavier University
Grove City College
Marywood College
David Lipscomb College
St. Mary's University, San Antonio
*University of Richmond
*University of Puget Sound
Point Loma College
University of Redlands
Whittier College
Illinois Wesleyan University
Olivet Nazarene College
St. Mary's College
Aquinas College
Augsburg College
*Bethel College, Minnesota
*College of St. Catherine
*St. Johns University
Avila College
*Bloomfield College
Upsala College
Antioch University
Oklahoma Baptist University
Beaver College
Moravian College
Westminster College

Tennessee Temple University
Houston Baptist University
Texas Wesleyan College
University of Dallas
*Walla Walla College
West Virginia Wesleyan College
*St. Norbert College

Canadian Universities

*#The University of Alberta
*#University of British Columbia
*#University of Calgary
*#University of Lethbridge
*#University of Manitoba
*#University of Regina
*#University of Saskatchewan
#University of Victoria
#Simon Fraser University
#University of New Brunswick